School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1331244

GÖRAN FORKMAN

The Limits of the Religious Community

EXPULSION FROM THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY
WITHIN THE QUMRAN SECT, WITHIN RABBINIC JUDAISM,
AND WITHIN PRIMITIVE
CHRISTIANITY

CB

CONIECTANEA BIBLICA

NEW TESTAMENT SERIES 5

CWK GLEERUP LUND SWEDEN

BM
175
Q6
F6

GÖRAN FORKMAN

The Limits of the Religious Community

EXPULSION FROM THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY
WITHIN THE QUMRAN SECT, WITHIN RABBINIC JUDAISM,
AND WITHIN PRIMITIVE
CHRISTIANITY

CWK GLEERUP LUND SWEDEN

Translated by Pearl Sjölander, BA

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

ISBN 91-970010-0-7
©Göran Forkman
Printed in Sweden
Studentlitteratur
Lund 1972

To My Parents

Contents

INTRODUCTION 9

I. SOME OLD TESTAMENT CONDITIONS 16

A Which Deviations Lead to Expulsion? 16
1. Death Penalty 16 2. כרת 17 3. נדל 20
4. חרם 21 5. אלה 23 6. ארר 24
7. קלל 25 8. בער 26

B Which Theological Motifs are Connected with Expulsion? 28

Notes to Chapter I 35

II. EXPULSION FROM THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY WITHIN THE QUMRAN SECT 39

A Which Deviations Led to Expulsion? 41
1. Idolworship 41 2. Defiance of God 42
3. Sexual Offences 42 4. Ritual Offences 43
5. Social Offences 45 6. Disciplinary Offences 46
7. Conclusion 46

B How was Expulsion Carried Out? 47
1. Reproving 47 2. Judicial Instance 50 3. Consequences of Expulsion 52 a. The Manual 52 b. The Damascus Document 63 c. The Rule of the Congregation 67 d. The Essenes 68 4. Conclusion 69

C Which Theological Motifs were Connected with Expulsion? 70
1. The Covenant Motif 70 2. The Holiness Motif 74
3. Conclusion 78

Notes to Chapter II 79

III. EXPULSION FROM THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY WITHIN RABBINIC JUDAISM 87

A Which Deviations Led to Expulsion? 89
1. Expulsion from the Pharisaic Community 89
2. Birkat ha-minim 90 3. The Ban 92 4. Conclusion 98

B How was Expulsion Carried Out? 99

1. Judicial Instance 99 2. Consequences and Function of the Ban 100 3. Conclusion 104 Excursus: Some NT Information on Expulsion from the Jewish Community 105

C Which Theological Motifs were Connected with Expulsion? 106

Notes to Chapter III 108

IV. EXPULSION FROM THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY WITHIN PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY 115

A Analysis of Some Important Texts 116
1. Matt. 18 116 a. Matt. 18 - a Literary Unit 116
b. Who is the Greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven? 119
c. If Your Hand Causes You to Sin 121 d. If Your Brother Sins 124
2. 2 Thess. 3:6-15 132 a. Connection with 1 Thess. 132
b. Withdraw Yourselves from "the Undisciplined" 134
c. Paul's Example and Instruction 135 d. Work Quietly 136
e. Measures to be Taken by the Church 137
3. 1 Cor. 5 139 a. Context 139 b. The Introduction 141
c. Expulsion of the Fornicator 141 d. Purge Out the Leaven 147
e. Expulsion of Fornicators and Other Transgressors 149
4. 1 John 5:16-17 151 a. Place and Function of the Passage in 1 John 151 b. What is "Sin unto Death?" 152
5. Rev. 2-3 156 a. Place of the Letters in the Book of Revelation 156 b. Problems of the Churches 156
c. Sanctions against Heretics 159 d. The Letters and the Religious "Zeal" 160

B Which Deviations Led to Expulsion? 163
1. The Synoptic Gospels 163 2. Paul 170 3. Other NT Writings 172 a. Acts 172 b. The Johannine Literature 174
c. The Pastoral Letters 176 d. Hebrews 176
4. Conclusion 177

C How was Expulsion Carried Out? 178
1. The Synoptic Gospels 178 2. Paul 179 3. Other NT Writings 182 a. Acts 182 b. The Johannine Literature 182
c. The Pastoral Letters 183 d. James 184 e. Jude 185
4. Conclusion 186

D Which Theological Motifs were Connected with Expulsion? 187
1. The Synoptic Gospels 187 a. The Holiness Motif 187
b. The Covenant Motif 188 c. The Motif of "the Kingdom of God" 189 2. Paul 191 3. Other NT Writings 193

Notes to Chapter IV 196

FINAL REMARKS 216

ABBREVIATIONS 218

LITERATURE QUOTED AND CONSULTED 219

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS 237

INDEX OF REFERENCES 241

Introduction

The question of conditions for tolerance is one of the problems of life today. We notice how societies and groups consciously or subconsciously differentiate themselves from each other. Sometimes we interpret the result as positive (tradition, loyalty, unity). Sometimes the consequences are catastrophic (isolation, intolerance, conflict). We can see how norms, spoken or unspoken, are developed in all types of communities, and how those who deviate are punished or at worst, thrust out of the community. Most people call themselves tolerant and demand toleration of others, but not all are aware that repressive processes are at work in their own group. Hardly anyone would tolerate true tolerance.

I feel, therefore, that a study of where different types of communities have fixed the limits for their tolerance, is a worthwhile task. Which deviations have they refused to approve? How have they set about expelling someone who differs? How have they motivated their conduct? The answer to such questions is seldom encouraging, but it can perhaps tell us something about the nature of human fellowship.

As far as the churches are concerned, the question of the limits of fellowship is particularly topical. In Scandinavia the Lutheran churches have retained their organisational connection with the state since the days of cultural unity. But time has passed. Nowadays there is room for many attitudes to life and many beliefs within the same people, and the old churches have to find new ways to separate themselves from the society. In the developing countries the establishment and consolidation of church communities is in progress. In other parts of the world the churches have to reconsider their position in society. This means that in many places one is asking: "Which principles shall act as guidelines when the rules for membership are to be fixed? Can every deviation from the church's norms be tolerated? If not, where should the line be drawn?" There are no scientific answers to such questions. The problems have to be solved by the churches with reference to their beliefs and set of values. But it should be interesting to investigate how these questions were answered in New Testament times, in the company round Jesus, in the primitive church and in other similar communities. Such a task is scientific, historic, exegetic, and its outcome should be of interest to the churches of today.

Also bearing in mind the field of research, there is a need of this kind of investigation. There are two favourite areas for exegetic research about the church. On the one hand, much attention has been devoted to the ministry in the primitive church. On the other hand, the background and

import of the sacraments of the primitive church have been investigated. In both these areas important conclusions have been reached. But it is quite conceivable that the question of the limits of fellowship can give just as much information about how one regarded oneself in the primitive church, and can show in which respects one did or did not detach oneself from one's environment. In the primitive church - as in other groups - a system of sanctions was gradually developed against those who deviated from the norms of the community. The study of these sanctions should be able to give us information concerning the community's distinctive character.

A modern attempt to give a conclusive presentation of the measures taken by the primitive church against those who deviated, was made by Rudolf Bohren 1952. His book, Das Problem der Kirchenzucht im Neuen Testament,[1] can be seen as a typical example of the "new church view" which became popular in many circles during the 1940's.[2] Like the advocates of this church view stressed that the church had at one and the same time a spiritual and an earthly significance (at the same time charismatic and legal), Bohren also wanted to show that church discipline belonged to the church from the beginning. He found "Kirchenzucht" everywhere in the NT - only the word itself was missing. The starting point was taken from three NT pictures of the church: the house, Christ's bride, Christ's body. Bohren was of the opinion that these pictures in themselves implied church discipline. But he over-interpreted them and overlooked the role of historical development. Unfortunately this work, because of its deficient method, soon became out of date.

In 1958 Walter Doskocil's book, Der Bann in der Urkirche, was published. This book, in contrast to Bohren's, is historically arranged. The NT writings or groups of writings, are dealt with separately, and the author is at pains to show a development. He distinguishes two lines, which from the beginning are separate, but which gradually tend to unite. One line is made up of the curse, the calling down of God's anger over a sinner. This line is best expressed in 1 Cor. 5 and Acts 5. The other line consists of exclusion from the brotherly fellowship, and gets its impact in Matt. 18:15-17 and 2 Thess. 3:14-15. We recognize here the old tension between charisma and law. Like the predecessors for the "new church view", Doskocil wanted to give both the charismatic and the institutional line a recognized place in the church from the beginning. He took Matt. 18:15-17 as a direct testimony of Jesus' own teaching, and in it saw the church's ban legitimized. But, a more careful analysis of the texts gives a different result, which causes Doskocil's construction to totter. His handling of comparative material is not satisfying either. Thus the Qumran texts get a very superficial presentation and are not confronted with the NT.[3]

Two important contributions towards the question of expulsion from religious communities during NT times have been made by Claus-Hunno Hunzinger. In his unpublished dissertation of 1954, Die jüdische Bann-

praxis im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, he maintained, in my view convincingly, that the earlier picture of the Jewish ban in NT times must be revised. Chapter III below is built to a great extent on Hunzinger's thesis. But his book has one limitation. It does not take into consideration the radical reconstruction of the Jewish community in connection with the Jewish war and the fall of the temple in 70 A.D. In a lecture from 1961, Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung der Disziplinarordnung der Gemeinde von Qumran, published in 1963, Hunzinger dealt with the disciplinary measures in Qumran. It was apparently Hunzinger's intention to let these investigations lead to a work about NT church discipline, but as far as I know nothing has come of it yet.

In 1966 J.E. Mignard presented his typewritten doctor's thesis, Jewish and Christian Cultic Discipline to the Middle of the Second Century. Mignard's investigation covers the OT, the OT apocrypha, the pseudepigrapha, the Qumran texts, the rabbinic literature, the NT, and the apostolic fathers - a wide area. He wants to show that the disciplinary practice of the primitive church was completely separate from and independent of the Jewish practice. Notwithstanding many valuable analyses of texts, one has to admit that Mignard pushes his thesis too far. His conclusion reads thus: "One cannot speak of the dependence of the church on any form of Jewish discipline."[4] I hope to be able to show that this is an obvious exaggeration.

With this the most important works on expulsion from the primitive church and similar Jewish communities have been named.[5] Taking this as a starting point, one can describe the need thus: There is a need for an investigation of expulsions which does justice to both similarities and dissimilarities between the various religious communities in NT times, an investigation which both points to the connections between the ways the groups act, and at the same time allows the distinctive character of each group to appear. Such an investigation should not only inquire into the outward, concrete procedure but also into the group's attitude towards expulsions, and how it described, motivated and interpreted what was happening. Such an investigation must also take into consideration the development within each type of community. Judaism after 70 A.D. is not the same as Judaism before the fall of the temple. The fellowship around Jesus is not the same as the church after Easter. Even within the Qumran Sect a development took place.

This book makes an attempt at such an investigation. I have formulated the title in a general way, to indicate that the questions are of broad human interest though the material is antique and tied to a special environment. The expression "religious community" denotes a group of individuals who share important religious norms, and who therefore feel a mutual connection. The expression "limit" denotes here, that which separates members from non-members. The subtitle states with what reference the religious community's limits are to be studied. I want to

examine what happens when members are "expelled", that is to say dispatched from the community or declared as having lost their membership. Accordingly, attention is primarily concentrated on the sanctions from the group's side, which more or less completely exclude members from the community. Other phenomena are dealt with only to the extent that they contribute to the understanding of the "limit". For example, other forms of punishments and pressures, the voluntary withdrawal of membership by members themselves, the steps taken by an expelled member to return - all this does not really belong to the object of this investigation, but can still be brought in when it throws light on the expulsions themselves. This investigation concentrates on three ancient communities, the scopes of which are more closely defined at the befinning of each respective chapter: the Qumran Sect, Rabbinic Judaism, Primitive Christianity.

In what way will this problem be tackled? To begin with it is of interest to know which deviations within each community brought about expulsion. Authorities on social psychology talk of how a system of norms is perfected within the human group, which are characteristic of that group, and how those who deviate from the norms are subjected to sanctions.[6] If these sanctions do not lead to the desired result, namely that the one who deviates falls back into line, then the contacts are gradually reduced until he can no longer be counted as one of the group - he is cast out. Something similar can be said to apply to the communities which are of immediate interest here, but we can count on a certain amount of leeway, before these large communities take action on deviation. Not every deviation from every norm sets in motion the procedures for expulsion. Only first when those norms, which in a certain situation are felt to be of vital importance, are sabotaged, does this extreme measure have to be taken. If we can find out on which points one was so sensitive that one had to expel the offender, then we will probably also know which norms were felt to be the most important in the community.

Secondly, I want to inquire into how this expelling was carried out, because expulsion can take on such widely differing forms, can be executed in different ways and can have different results. It can be formed like a charismatic devotion, as when Paul, with the church in Corinth, surrenders the fornicator to Satan (1 Cor. 5). It can be an established judicial punishment, meted out by a court or a magistrate on the grounds of present rules or precedents, as we will find in Qumran. It can lead to social isolation, freezing people out, breaking off of social intercourse and fellowship at mealtimes. And, it can work in such a way that the afflicted one himself had to leave the community, as was the case with the Jewish birkat ha-minim.

The form of these expulsions can be defined in three different ways. An expulsion can be either temporary or definite, that is to say, it can either be possible to raise it, perhaps after a specified time or

after some kind of counter effort by the one who is punished, or irrevocable, so that the one who is expelled can never return, however much he repents, or however much time has passed. Then too, expulsion can be either partial or total. The person involved can be excluded from certain sections of the fellowship while he remains in others. He is then still counted as a member, though not in the same way or to the same extent as before. Or, he can be disfellowshipped completely, deprived of every form of participation in the religious community to which he belonged. Expulsion can also be either informal or formal. This implies that it can be decided on and carried out with different degrees of formality or regularity. If a member who violates the norms of the society is avoided by his friends, by a tacit understanding, without anything actually having been decided about it, then the expulsion is informal. But if the case is brought before some kind of court or magistrate by whom sanctions are decreed, then the expulsion is formal.

These terms describe alternatives which are not mutually exclusive. Rather they constitute four scales along which the phenomenon of expulsion moves. Through the means of defining the position of expulsions on these scales, we can get a picture of how expulsions were done, the outward act, the concrete effects, when someone was placed outside the limits of the community. The term "excommunication" is avoided in the following but could most closely correspond to definite, total and formal expulsion.

Thirdly, it is important to inquire into which theological motifs were connected with these expulsions. Already the answers to the question as to which deviations led to expulsion, can tell us something about such motifs. One can on the one hand speak of outward, concrete reasons for disfellowshipping an offender (for example, someone breaks a definite ritual law, or raises objections to a certain teacher). On the other hand, one can from there make abstractions to more general norms which the offender has violated (for example, he has sullied the community's holiness, he has endangered its unity). But these norms are connected with the theological view, on the community and its function, which the members held.

Even the outward manner in which the expulsion was put into operation, can tell us - as we will see - something about the theological motifs.

But it is of particular importance to investigate how the community own writings motivate and describe expulsion. It can be done in many different ways. An expulsion can be spoken of as a warning example to prevent other members from breaking the covenant. Or it can be said to have taken place so that the holy would not be polluted. It can be interpreted as a measure to preserve the unity of the community. It can be seen as merely a confirmation that the one expelled had himself left the community. Or it can be said to be done out of consideration for

the offender, so that he can amend and return. Behind these descriptions, motivations and interpretations we can trace definite theological motifs, which are characteristic to the respective communities.

These three questions (Which deviations led to expulsion? How was expulsion carried out? Which theological motifs were connected with expulsion?) can probably be answered in different ways, with different methods and terminology. For present-day material, or historical material of a richer and simpler kind, the preferable line of procedure would probably be sociological or that of social psychology.[7] But the texts for these three relevant communities are of a special nature. They consist to a large extent of traditional literature, in which older material was taken up and furnished with new accentuations; they have often arisen out of unique situations, which have left their mark on the wording; they have, as a rule quite definite messages, which do not always fit into our questions. In this case, therefore, it is necessary to analyse the texts exegetically and historically, at least at a first stage. This is the procedure used here. I consequently, in the following, make no claim to be working from a sociological or social psychological view point, even if I do note some social psychological ideas.

All of these three relevant communities are built on to an older standardized tradition, which corresponds to our Old Testament as far as the most important parts are concerned. It is therefore appropriate to begin this investigation with a chapter on the Old Testament conditions. The object of Chap. I is not to give a historic account of expulsion procedure during Old Testament times, but only to present, in a general way, the material of norms and theological motifs which form a background for expulsion from the three communities in question. Therefore, in Chap. I, I only inquire into which deviations according to the OT lead to expulsion, and which theological motifs are connected with them, while the question of how the expulsions were put into operation, is dropped out. Both Chap. II and Chap. III are arranged according to the three questions I have set. Chap. IV, the main point of the investigation, is introduced by a section of analysis of a few important texts, after which the three questions are taken up one by one.

Notes to the Introduction

1) For considerations of space the reader is directed to the bibliography for bibliographical information. In the notes, only the author's name will be given, and a key-word, usually the first noun in the title.
2) A presentation of this church view is found in F. M. Braun, Licht, 93ff.

3) Doskocil has later given an excellent comprehensive survey of this subject in the article "Excommunication" in RAC VII, 1-22.
4) J. E. Mignard, Discipline, 255.
5) G. Ebeling, Kirchenzucht (1947), repudiates the exegetic way of handling the question of church discipline and chooses instead a dogmatic method. From among a series of essays with more or less specialized angles of views the following should be mentioned. P. Bonnard, "La discipline ecclésiastique, selon le Nouveau Testament" (1947), points out some important theological concepts which are common to the NT texts on discipline. As the visible body of Christ the whole church had authority to exercise discipline, but only in a provisional way and not according to fixed rules. E. Kohlmeyer, "Charisma oder Recht?" (1952), turns against Sohm's well-known distinction between charisma and law, and he handles, among other things, Matt. 18 and 1 Cor. 5 from the viewpoint that they give evidence of a sacral right. His analysis of 1 Cor. 5 is of value, but the relation between Matt. 18 and the Jewish ban is wrongly depicted. S. Lieberman, "The Discipline of the so-called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline" (1952), throws light on a series of terms and expressions in 1QS with rabbinic material. O. Schmitz, "Die Grenze der Gemeinde nach dem Neuen Testament" (1954), presents a concise examination of a large number of Bible passages, arranged according to certain dogmatic views. J. Schmitt, "Contribution à l'étude de la discipline Pénitentielle dans l'Église primitive à la lumière des textes de Qumran" (1957), draws up the parallels between 1QS and CD and between Matt. 18:12-18 and Acts 5:1-11. J. Murphy-O'Connor, "Péché et Communauté dans le Nouveau Testament" (1967), has to a certain extent a wider subject than ours, but he briefly deals with a series of NT passages which are of interest to us. G. W. H. Lampe, "Church Discipline and the Interpretation of the Epistles to the Corinthians" (1967), stresses the pastoral function in the primitive church's discipline. In his stylistically elegant article he pleads, among other things, for the old hypothesis, that 1 Cor. 5 and 2 Cor. 2 refer to the same case.
6) For example, T. Newcomb, Social Psychology, 264ff; S. Wermlund, Människan, 188f; J. Israel, Socialpsykologi, 51-54; E. Dahlström in J. Israel, Sociala avvikelser, 18-23.
7) See e.g. the essays collected in Die Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche, Mainz 1964.

I. Some Old Testament Conditions

In this introductory chapter (I) a few OT conditions are dealt with which form a basis for expulsion from the religious community within the Qumran Sect (Chap. II), within Rabbinic Judaism (Chap. III), and within Primitive Christianity (Chap. IV). Here the object is not that of presenting the historical development in Old Testament times - be it of the expulsion procedure or the motifs connected with it. The task is considerably more modest: to describe briefly the Old Testament norms and patterns of thought which the three above-mentioned communities could make use of in working out their rules for expulsion. Consequently it is the OT, as it existed at the beginning of the Christian Era, which is the object of our investigation - not the old Israelite community, the Jewish people, or such-like. In this way the historical questions, to a large extent, fall outside our field of vision. They are taken up only when they can bring into full relief the presentation of a norm or motif.

In order to bring out the most important conditions, I first inquire into which deviations, according to the OT, lead to expulsion from the community. In that connection I proceed from a "neutral" picture of which deviations are punished by death. After that I deal with a series of different expressions which imply expulsion of one form or other, and examine which deviations these expressions apply to, and then compare the result with the "neutral" picture. In the second section I inquire into which theological motifs are connected with expulsion from the community. In so doing, I will try - still without describing any historical development - to characterize the patterns of thought utilized to describe and motivate expulsion.[1]

A. Which Deviations Lead to Expulsion?

1. The death penalty is dealt with in the following OT texts: Gen. 9:5-6; 38:24; Ex. 19:12f; 21:12-17, 29; 22:17f; 31:12-15; 35:2; Lev. 20; 21:9; 24:10-17, 21; 27:29; Num. 1:51; 3:10, 38; 15:32-36; 18:7; 25:1-5; 35:16-34; Deut. 13:1-12; 17:2-7, 12; 18:20; 19:11f; 21:18-21; 22:13-27; 24:7, 16; Josh. 1:18; 7:15; Judg. 20:13; 21:5; 2 Kings 14:6; 2 Chron. 15:13; 25:4; Ezek. 18:13.[2]

These texts belong to widely differing contexts and times and are

of varied literary character. They are therefore suitable for giving a "neutral" picture of who, in the OT, are regarded as deserving death. Against this neutral picture the following more distinctive expressions will later be placed.

There are essentially five types of offence which are imposed with the death penalty. First and foremost, he who worships strange gods forfeits the right to live. Lev. 20:2-4 prescribes that the people must stone those who sacrifice to Molech. If the people does not comply with this, then God himself will turn against this man and cut him off. More particularly are those who are representatives for idols - prophets and visionaries who preach apostasy (Deut. 13:6), the sorceress (Ex. 22:17), those who practice exorcism or devination (Lev. 20:27) - to be punished by death. Even if he be a close relative you must not spare his life, says Deut. 13:7-12.

Furthermore, serious ritual offences are punishable by death. The commandment to keep the sabbath holy is particularly enjoined (Ex. 31:14f; 35:2; Num. 15:35). The sabbath is to be kept holy "that you may know that I am Yahweh who hallows you" (Ex. 31:13).[3] When Yahweh came down on to Mount Sinai no-one was allowed to come near it. One was not even allowed to touch someone who possibly had broken the prohibition, obviously to prevent the powerful holiness from spreading (Ex. 19:12). Even the holiness of the temple and the priests was protected by the threat of punishment by death (Num. 1:51; 3:10, 38; 18:7). Here the recurring formula is: "Any unqualified person who intrudes upon it shall be put to death".

Certain sexual offences result in serious impurity and have to be suppressed by the death penalty. Lev. 20:10-21 lists the forbidden relationships: adultery, intimate relationships with close relatives or with animals.

A series of social crimes are also punishable by death. Murder (Ex. 21:12, 14; Lev. 24:17, 21; Num. 35:16-18, 21, 30f; Deut. 19:11f), disrespect of parents (Ex. 21:15, 17; Lev. 20:9), kidnapping (Ex. 21:16) are punished with death. A man who, in spite of warnings, lets his oxe gore a person to death, shall be killed (Ex. 21:29). Bad treatment of widows and the fatherless will be punished by God Himself (Ex. 22:21-23), but it is unclear if he will use man's help.

Lastly, those who openly scorn Yahweh must be killed. Lev. 24:16 thus decrees the death penalty for the one who blasphemes God's name. Here we should also add the passages where the death penalty is laid on those who openly defy the people's leaders. If anyone impeaches a sentence pronounced by a judge or priest, then he must die, because it is Yahweh's sentence he is judging (Deut. 17:12, cf. Josh. 1:18).

2. כרת means in nifal "be cut off", "be exterminated"; in hifil "cut off", "destroy", "annihilate".[4] In the sense of "(be) cut off from Israel", the

word occurs in the Pentateuch in Gen. 17:14; Ex. 12:15, 19; 30:33, 38; 31:14; Lev. 7:20f, 25, 27; 17:4, 9f, 14; 18:29; 19:8; 20:3, 5, 17f; 22:3; 23:29; Num. 4:18; 9:13; 15:30f; 19:13, 20. All these texts belong to what one usually calls the Priestly Code (P) and the Holiness Code (H).[5] Outside the Pentateuch this word occurs, with the same meaning, in the following passages: 1 Sam. 2:33; 28:9; 1 Kings 9:7; 14:10, 14; 21:21; 2 Kings 9:8; Isa. 9:13; 48:9; Jer. 44:7f, 11; Ezek. 14:8; Zeph. 1:4; Zech. 13:8; Mal. 2:12; Ps. 37:9; Prov. 2:22.

On going through these texts we get a picture which differs in some respects from the neutral picture described above. The theological consciousness is greater. The stipulations as to which deviations will cause a person to be cut off are often provided with explicit motivations, to which we will return later. The central point lies with the ritual and sexual norms. One whole category of deviations is missing: the social category.

The cutting off of idols in Israel is the most important. "I will destroy your images and all the sacred pillars in your land; you shall no longer bow in reverence before things your own hands made" (Mic. 5:12, cf. Lev. 26:30; Zech. 13:2; Judg. 6:28). It is a matter of cutting down and smashing the idols to pieces so that not even their name remains. The upholders of the strange gods have to be cut off in the same way. Saul exterminated exorcists and deviners (1 Sam. 28:9). The prophets and priests who serve idols must be cut off from Jerusalem (Zeph. 1:4). Even those who have fallen for the temptation to worship idols have forfeited their standing as Israelites (1 Kings 14:10, 14; 21:21). And, it does not help to turn to Yahweh's prophet (Ezek. 14:7f). Even Israelites who have married idolatrous women must be cut off (Mal. 2:11f).

Not only the idol-worshipper himself, but even his relatives, must be cut off (Lev. 20:5). It was obviously not just a question of the one with personal guilt being punished. Rather, they thought that the idol gave out a kind of unclean force. Even he who has only come into indirect contact with this force is contaminated. The people must be kept clean from such as these.

There are also lower degrees of uncleanness, from which one can free oneself by means of offerings and purifications. But, if anyone omits to cleanse himself, the people have to cut him off, to prevent the impurity from spreading and contaminating that which is clean. "If any man who is unclean does not get himself purified, that person shall be cut off from the assembly, because he has defiled the sanctuary of Yahweh" (Num. 19:20).

It is particularly dangerous to touch the holy objects when one is unclean. God and idols are alike in this respect that it is dangerous to come close to them due to the power they emanate. Of the Levites, the children of Kohath were to look after the most holy articles (Num. 4:4ff). But the problem was that the Kohathites were not holy enough to handle the most holy things. First of all the priests, Aaron's sons, had to go and

cover over all the articles. The Kohathites could not even see them or they would have to be cut off.

This fear of mixing the clean with the unclean, the holy with the unholy, lies behind many of the ritual laws which were inculcated with the threat of extermination. He who, in an unclean state touches the holy gifts must be cut off (Lev. 22:3). He who uses holy things in an unclean area (ointment, incense, Ex. 30:33, 38), must be cut off. On the other hand, he who neglects to observe the holy times, who does not mortify himself on the day of Atonement, or does not keep the Passover, must also be cut off, if he cannot put the blame on his being unclean or on travels (Lev. 23:29; Num. 9:13).

Blood belongs to the holy area and must be handled accordingly. It must not be eaten (Lev. 7:27; 17:14). At every slaughter certain sacrificial rites have to sanctify the undertaking. Otherwise it will be accounted as bloodguilt to the slaughterer: "that man has shed blood and he shall be cut off from his people" (Lev. 17:4).

Even a group of sexual laws are provided with the threat of extermination. Lev. 18 lists the forbidden liaisons. These things do not just defile those concerned, but also the whole land, and can cause Israel's people to be spewn out. That is why each one who does thus must be cut off from among his people.

The ritual and the sexual laws are thus seen as a guard for God's holiness, and on a lower plane, Israel's holiness. The holiness of God and the temple must not be desecrated through ritual offences. Israel's holiness must not be desecrated through unclean associations.

He who sins unintentionally can be purified by means of a sin offering. But he who "sins with lifted hand" mocks Yahweh and scorns Yahweh's words. He bears a misdeed and must be cut off (Num. 15:27-31).

Thus we find that, of the five types of deviation belaid with the death penalty, all except one are to be found in the rules for cutting sinners off. If people sin against their fellowmen it is nowhere stated that they shall be cut off.

(To what extent have these rules regarding extermination been carried out? Undoubtedly this "cutting off" implies, in principle, death. For example, Ex. 31:14 equates "cutting off" with the death penalty. But just the fact that social sins are not punished by the person being cut off implies that the texts are intended to be more fundamental than practical. Even other considerations point in the same direction. For the most part the verb in these texts is in the passive (nifal), in which case God is thought of as the agent.[6] Where the verb is active (hifil), God is usually the subject.[7] Only in three passages, which completely lack the characteristics of law passages, do we possibly find this verb with a human subject, and with the meaning of "cut off from Israel".[8] The act of cutting a person off has therefore, in all likelihood, not been practised as a formal sanction. W. Zimmerli imagines it as a kind of informal expulsion

from the fellowship at religious services.[9] M. Tsevat wants to identify the Old Testament "cutting off" with the rabbinic karet punishment, which signifies that God allowed a sinner to die an untimely death.[10] Whatever form this "cutting off" may have taken, it is obvious that this punishment was limited to certain circles close to P, and that it protected a system of norms in which the ritual laws predominated.)

3. בדל means in the nifal "withdraw from", "be separated", and in the hifil "divide from", "put a difference between", "separate from".[11] Normally this word is used for separating someone out from an evil surrounding into something better or for a specific task. Thus, this separation is seen as a religiously motivated act. Just as God at creation divided light from darkness (Gen. 1:4ff), has he also separated Israel from all other peoples (Lev. 20:24ff) and in the same way it is a matter of separating between that which is holy and unholy, between the clean and the unclean (Lev. 10:10), between animals that can or cannot be eaten (Lev. 11:47). And in the same way that the veil separates the holy from the most holy (Ex. 26:33), the Levites were separated from within Israel (Num. 8:14; 16:9) and Aaron's sons were separated from within the tribe of Levi (1 Chron. 23:13).

But in four passages this word is used to denote that someone is separated from Israel.

Deut. 29:20 states what happens when someone turns away from Yahweh in order to worship idols. For him there will be no forgiveness. A curse will rest on him. Yahweh will blot out his name and separate him from all the tribes of Israel for disaster to fall upon him.

Neh. 13:3 tells how in connection with the renewing of the covenant all strangers were separated from the people of Israel. The instructions for this were taken from Deut. 23:2-4 where it says that three categories of people would not be allowed entrance in to Yahweh's assembly:
a) eunuchs, b) persons born outside wedlock, and their offspring,
c) Ammonites and Moabites.

Isa. 56:3ff obviously refers to the same rule, but heralds a time when it shall be revoked. Eunuchs and strangers who join themselves to Yahweh, and who keep the sabbaths do not need to fear that Yahweh will sever them. "The foreigner who has given his allegiance to Yahweh must not say, Yahweh will keep me separate from his people forever; and the eunuch must not say, I am nothing but a barren tree."

According to Ezra 10:8 he, who did not present himself in Jerusalem within three days of having been summoned by the princes and elders, would be punished in two ways. His property would be destroyed (יחרם כל רכושו) and he himself would be separated from the community of the exiles (יבדל מקהל הגולה).

In Deut. 29:20 and Isa. 56:3 it only talks of God's activity. Not until Ezra 10:8 and Neh. 13:3 is the word used to describe a human action.

In this connection it is interesting to note that the measure taken neither involves nor intends the offender's death. Here we have the only clear Old Testament examples of a formal expulsion, in which the offender is neither put to death nor solely given over to the punishment of God. Only here do we come across expulsion as a specific human sanction, which probably is due to the fact that the religious community's limits no longer coincided with the ethnic or political boundaries.

4. חרם seems to have the basic meaning of "refuse", "forbid" and forms, in the Old Testament usage, somewhat of a negative counterpart to קדש.[12] That which is dedicated to a god other than Yahweh, is forbidden for Israel. It must be "devoted", given over to annihilation or be withdrawn from ordinary use by being reserved for Yahweh.[13] Both the verb and the noun are used in the OT in connection with the holy war. The cities and peoples captured by Israel had belonged to another god. Now they had to be handed over to Yahweh by means of their destruction.

The words are therefore used mostly about enemies and confiscated goods. But in certain cases even an Israelite could be "devoted". The following passages are relevant: Ex. 22:19; Deut. 7:26; 13:14ff; Josh. 6:18; 7:12; Isa. 43:28; Jer. 25:9; Zech. 14:11; Mal. 3:24. That this "devotion" could also befall Israelite possessions is shown in the following passages: Lev. 27:21, 28; Num. 18:14; Ezra 10:8; Ezek. 44:29.

According to the OT, two types of deviation are punishable by "devotion". Both offences are connected with the primitive concepts of taboo.

First of all, idolworship is punished. This has, naturally enough, its foundation in the fact that idols were regarded as taboo. He who concerns himself with them is infected by their power and must be destroyed. Deut. 7:25 thus forbids Israelites to touch captured gods, "for it is abominable (תועבה) for Yahweh your God". The following verse brings home the risk of contamination: "You must not introduce anything abominable into your houses and thus bring yourselves under solemn ban along with it (והיית חרם כמהו)." Therefore Ex. 22:19 also decrees: "Whoever sacrifices to any god but Yahweh, shall be put to death under solemn ban (יחרם)."

Secondly, those who violate the spoils of war are to be punished. That which is captured in a holy war must be regarded as most holy. It must not be bought or sold; it must not even be touched (Deut. 13:18). He who takes that which is "devoted" must himself be "devoted". Joshua 7 tells what happened when Achan took some of the booty from Jerico. Yahweh's anger was kindled immediately, success in the war ended, and the whole of Israel became חרם, because Achan had not observed the prohibition. When the lot exposed Achan it was not enough that just he himself was destroyed. His whole family, his possessions and what he had taken, had to be destroyed. חרם contaminates. And it does not just

infect the one who touches the spoils, but the whole complex in which he finds himself (cf. 1 Sam. 15:9-23; 1 Kings 20:42).

These concepts strongly remind us of what we found when examining כרת. In the same way as he who mixed the holy with the unholy, the clean with the unclean had to be cut off, so the one who breaks a taboo in one of the above-mentioned cases has to be destroyed, otherwise Israel as a whole will be devastated.

(This "devotion" was originally carried out in a very violant way. The idol had to be burned on a fire, Deut. 7:25. When Jerico was "devoted", the inhabitants were slain by the sword, while the city itself was burned, Josh. 6:21, 24. Josh. 7 is of special interest. Achan was exposed through the casting of lots, in other words by a judgment of God. He had to make a public doxology and confession. Afterwards he was stoned and burned, in the valley of Achor, together with his family and his possessions.[14] P and Ezek. seem to give evidence of milder practices. Such property as was declared to be חרם, did not need to be destroyed. It could be handed over to the temple and the priests, who with their higher degree of holiness could handle very holy things (Lev. 27:21, 28; Num. 18:14; Ezek. 44:29). Here חרם has lost its connection with the holy war and come to mean "votive gift", "reserved for sacral use". The regulations are reminiscent of the measures taken to prevent the Kohathites from being cut off (see p. 18f).)

Still another passage is of interest in our context. Ezra 10:8 (cf. p. 20 above) states which punishment was prescribed for persons who did not appear in Jerusalem within three days of having been ordered to do so by the princes and elders. Their possessions had to be devoted (יחרם). that presumably means to say handed over to the priests, and they themselves were separated from the congregation (יבדל). It is thought that we here have the point of departure for the later Jewish ban in its severe form (חרם).[15] But this interpretation cannot be supported. In Ezra 10:8 things, not people, are declared as חרם, while expulsion of people is indicated by בדל. Not until the third century A.D. do we find חרם in rabbinic literature for describing a disciplinary measure.[16]

When it comes to throwing light on later expulsion procedures the OT חרם has very little relevance.[17] On the one hand it is used in connection with the holy war and is then directed against people and things which have been belaid with a taboo because of contact with gods other than Yahweh. On the other hand it applies to objects which have been handed over to Yahweh, to the temple, or the priest, and which are thus withdrawn from profane use.

Even the curses have to be seen in connection with the magical conception of the world held by the people of Israel and of the surrounding nations. The curse is an effective, powerful word, and brings misfortune. It can be directed against people, but also against animals, ground, time

periods. It lives its own life, often without regard of guilt or innocence, and without the need of a judicial trial. It can carry out its work without a human agent. The curse has a wide field of application. It can be a magic power word, an expression of personal aversion or ridicule, a literary phrase or a legal formula in a criminal case, or in a treaty. The OT preserves the different shades of meaning by using different words.[18]

My task here is only to ask if, according to the OT, the curse was used in such a way against an Israelite, that he was considered shut out of the religious community, and if so, what were the motives for this. With these questions in mind, we will go through the different words for "curse" and "to curse".

5. אלה as a verb is rare, but more usual as a noun.[19] The basic meaning is presented somewhat differently by different people. H. C. Brichto stresses that the word indicates more the spoken word, oral or written, than the material misfortune. It has the basic meaning of "curse in the sense of imprecation or malediction".[20] J. Scharbert proceeds from the meaning "(to pronounce) a conditional curse".[21] The term has a clear juridical touch. At trials or settlements of legal character, it does happen that a conditional curse is pronounced, to strengthen an oath (1 Kings 8:31 = 2 Chron. 6:22), to get hold of an otherwise inaccessible offender (Judg. 17:2; Lev. 5:1) or to bind together the partners in an agreement (1 Sam. 14:24).[22]

For our study the following two cases are of interest.

a) אלה is thought to be efficacious without human means of punishment. Curses pronounced at a trial often take the form of conditional self-imprecation (1 Kings 8:31f). If the speaker's testimony is not true before the court, the malediction will befall him. In these instances it is obvious that the curse is not dependent on human measures. In other instances the curse can be directed against the accused person and associated with a trial by oracle (Num. 5:11ff). If the accused is injured by the oracle, he is considered struck by the curse and therefore guilty. Judg. 17:2 gives a further example. A woman has been robbed of a sum of money by an unknown thief. She pronounces a curse, which her son, the actual thief, hears. Because of the curse, the son no longer dares to keep the money and therefore hands it back. In order to prevent the curse from continuing to work, the mother balances it with a blessing "May Yahweh bless you, my son". Both mother and son reckoned that the curse would work without human intervention.[23]

אלה is therefore connected with juridical situations. But, as soon as it has been pronounced, it, so to say, leaves the human, judicial sphere. No more action has to be taken in order that the curse shall run its course. It carries with it its own misfortune. The question of justice or human sanctions falls into the background.

b) אלה is often used in close connection with ברית. Since G. E. Mendenhall, following V. Korošec, called attention to the Hittite vassal treaties, K. Baltzer and D. J. McCarthy, among others, have examined the forms for Biblical and extra-Biblical treaties.[24] The texts of these treaties regularly included blessings and curses which were intended to consolidate the treaty.[25] The Old Testament term for the curse attached to the end of a treaty is precisely אלה.[26] He who breaks the treaty, will be separated from Israel by Yahweh, "according to all the curses of the covenant" (Deut. 29:20). The connection with the treaty is so close that אלה in Deut. 29:11, 13, 18 is practically used synonymously with ברית.

The kind of deviations which are bemet with אלה are therefore dependent on the judicial situation in which the curse is used. Only in one specific aspect can אלה be understood to be a form of expulsion from the religious community: When Israel is regarded as a partner with God in a covenant which is sealed with curses. But even then the curse cannot be described as a concrete human measure for expulsion. It is rather the result of a deviator already having left the community. We will see in the next section which of these deviations are of immediate interest in this connection.

6. ארר is the strongest word for "to curse",[27] Formulas like ארור אתה, ארור (האיש) אשר and ארור plus a participle, are common in the OT. J. Pedersen emphasizes the social connection of this word.[28] It expresses that someone or something is thrust out of its natural context. The snake is thrust out (ארור מן) from among all the wild creatures (Gen. 3:14), Cain was thrust out (ארור מן) from the ground (Gen. 4:11). People or things which are ארור, are expelled from the community, singled out.

With Pedersen's interpretation one could expect that ארר would imply expulsion from Israel when it is directed against an Israelite.[29] However, the case is not as simple as that. Jacob curses Simeon and Levi (Gen. 49:7), but this does not mean that they are expelled from Israel. They only get no land like their brothers - "I will scatter them in Jacob". When Joshua had captured Jerico, he pronounced a curse: "Cursed (ארור) be the man before Yahweh who tries to rebuild this city Jerico" (Josh. 6:26). But the punishment does not comprise the offender's death or expulsion. He will lose his oldest and his youngest son (1 Kings 16:34). Joshua also curses the Gibeonites (Josh. 9:22f). They are allowed to live in Israel, they will not be killed, but are reduced to a low social standing: slaves, woodcutters, water carriers.

H. C. Brichto has also emphasized, in opposition to J. Pedersen, the magical connotation of the word. That which is ארור is bewitched, through a magic circle separated from the surrounding world.[30]

As far as we are concerned it is not necessary to take a stand as to whether ארר describes social expulsion or a magic curse. The difference would be difficult to maintain.[31] It is clear that the curse did not simply expel someone from the religious community. But, in one particular situation the curse does lead to expulsion from Israel and, as a last resort, to death. This is when the curses form an integral part of the covenant between Yahweh and Israel, as אלות. This is the case with the curses in Deut. 27 and 28.

Deut. 27:14ff. tells how the Levites, in connection with the making of the covenant, cry out curses in a loud voice. By answering "amen" the people accept the covenant and declare themselves ready to thrust out anyone who breaks the agreement.[32] The fate of the one who is cursed is described in the next chapter. According to these curses all conceivable horrors will be heaped on to the one who breaks the covenant. He is bewitched in the sense that all he undertakes will go wrong. In the beginning these curses do not seem to mean expulsion from Israel. The cursed one lives a normal life, except for the fact that everything goes wrong. But in the long run it has a devastating effect. It leads inevitably to chaos and destruction, because he who breaks a covenant with Yahweh has stepped out of the sphere of blessing, fortune and life, and is in reality given over to die.

Thus the curse in itself includes no expulsion from the religious community. But when it acts as a surety for a covenant between Yahweh and Israel, it functions unavoidably like total and definite expulsion. Which deviators are affected by these expulsion curses? Deut. 27:15-26 indicates which offences are meant: idol worship (v. 15), social crimes (17-19, 24f), sexual offences (20-23), disobedience (26). The list is reminiscent of the neutral picture we arrived at when examining the death penalty. But one type of offence, which carried the death penalty, is missing from this list - ritual offences call down no curse.

7. קלל in qal means "be slight, swift, of no account". In piel Gesenius gives the meaning as "curse", which seems rather strong. Piel here has a declarative sense.[33] J. Scharbert asserts that the basic meaning still remains in piel, and translates it as "als unbedeutend hinstellen, geringschätzen, für klein und unbedeutend erklären". Brichto translates it in a similar manner: "to treat with disrespect, abuse, derogate, repudiate".[34]

Thus, one must not insult one's parents (Ex. 21:17; Lev. 20:9), nor a person who is deaf (Lev. 19:14). One must not blaspheme God or His name (Ex. 22:27; Lev. 24:11ff, 23). Balaam was commissioned to revile Israel (Deut. 23:5; Josh. 24:9; Neh. 13:2). Gaal reviled Abimelech, and said insolent words (Judg. 9:26f), in the same way as David was reviled by Goliath (1 Sam. 17:43) and later by Shimei (2 Sam. 16:5ff).

The curses referred to here seem to be of a milder kind, the reviling of men, of which also God can become the object, even if the word can sometimes possess a magic power (2 Kings 2:24) and can, in exceptional cases, have God as the subject (Gen. 8:21).

קלל and קללה are therefore less likely to say anything about the limits of the religious community. Only in one situation are these abuses or calamities connected with expulsion from Israel, namely when they are part of curses which cement the covenant between Yahweh and Israel. In this context the words appear in the following passages: Deut. 11:26, 28 f; 27:13; 28:15, 45; 29:26; 30:1, 19; Josh. 8:34; Ps. 37:22.

These passages do not give us much more than we observed earlier. If Israel keeps the covenant all kinds of good fortune will befall her. If Israel breaks the covenant misfortune will strike. The words in Deut. 30:19 are typical: "I summon heaven and earth to witness against you this day: I offer you the choice of life or death, blessing or curse. Choose life and then you and your descendants will live."

There are a few more Old Testament words, זעם, נקב, קבב, which can be used to mean "curse" or something similar. But they appear so seldom that it is not essential, as far as we are concerned here, to deal with them.[35]

8. Finally, a formula for expulsion will be observed. בער means in piel "remove", "devastate".[36] The formula, "You must get rid of the wickedness" appears in four variations in Deut. in connection with judicial passages.

a) You must rid yourself of the wickedness
ובערת הרע מקרבך
(Deut. 13:6; 17:7; 19:19; 21:21; 22:24; 24:7).

b) You must rid Israel of the wickedness
ובערת הרע מישראל
(Deut. 17:12; 22:22).

c) You must rid yourself of the guilt of innocent blood
ואתה תבער הדם הנקי מקרבך
(Deut. 21:9).

d) You must rid Israel of the guilt of innocent blood
ובערת הדם הנקי מישראל
(Deut. 19:13).

Who are affected by this expulsion formula? The same groups as are affected by the ארור formula in Deut. 27. The idol-worshipper must be done away with (Deut. 13:6; 17:7). He who has committed sexual sins is punished in the same way (Deut. 22:21f, 24). Different kinds of deviators from social norms are mentioned: he who bears false witness (19:19), the viscious and insubordinate son (21:21), the kidnapper (24:7), and the murderer (19:13; 21:9). Contempt for Yahweh's word is not mentioned directly, as it was with ארור in Deut. 27:26. But the stipulation in

Deut. 17:12 comes near to it. He who openly defies the judge or the priest must be removed from Israel.

As with the ארור formula, ritual offences are completely missing.

(Contrary to the ארור formulas the בערת formulas seem to be intended to be put into operation by a human court. In all cases except one (Deut. 19:19) the death sentence is clearly stated. The proceedings of the trial are described, the method of execution is laid down, and it is even decreed what is to be done with the body. There is little doubt that the בערת formulas were once used in a strictly juridical context.)

Going through the different types of deviations which were associated with the death penalty, and with the expressions for "cut off", "separate", "devote", "curse" and "remove" has given a deal of information which I hope to utilize in the following section. The most important part of this information can be tabulated in the following way.

Which deviations lead to expulsion?

	Death penalty	כרת	ארר	בער
Idolworship	Ex. 22:17 Lev. 20:2f 20:27 Num. 25:1-5 Deut. 13:6, 10 17:6f 18:20 2 Chron. 15:13	Lev. 20:3, 5 1 Sam. 28:9 1 Kings 9:7 14:10, 14 21:21 2 Kings 9:8 Ezek. 14:8 Zeph. 1:4 Mal. 2:12	Deut. 27:15	Deut. 13:6 17:7
Contempt of Yahweh	Lev. 24:16 Deut. 17:12 Josh. 1:18	Num. 15:30f	Deut. 27:26	Deut. 17:12
Sexual offences	Gen. 38:24 Ex. 22:18 Lev. 20:10-21 21:9 Deut. 22:13-27	Lev. 18:29 20:17f	Deut. 27:20 27:21ff	Deut. 22:21f 22:24

	Death penalty	כרת	ארר	בער
Ritual offences	Ex. 19:12 31:14f 35:2 Num. 1:51 3:10,38 15:35 18:7	Gen. 17:14 Ex. 12:15,19 30:33,38 31:14 Lev. 7:20f 7:25,27 17:4,9f 17:14 19:8 22:3 23:29 Num. 4:18ff 9:13 19:13,20 1 Sam. 2:33	--	--
Social crimes	Gen. 9:5f Ex. 21:12-17 21:29 Lev. 20:9 24:17,21 Num. 35:16ff 35:21,30f Deut. 19:12	--	Deut. 27:16 27:17ff 27:24f	Deut. 19:13 19:19 21:9 21:21 24:7

B. Which Theological Motifs are Connected with Expulsion?

The previous section showed above all that there is a marked difference between the כרת material on the one side, and the ארור and בערת material on the other.

We found the following characteristics in the כרת passages. a) In the Pentateuch the כרת punishment appears only in one defined stratum, P and H. b) The rules orientate from a definite central point: That which is unclean, chiefly idols and what pertains to them, must be cut off. c) Attention is here directed to ritual and sexual laws; the social laws fall outside the field of vision.

What motivations are expressed in this material? The continually repeated motivation is: Yahweh is holy; He has sanctified Israel; therefore, Israel must be holy. This thought is formulated at length in for

example Lev. 20:7f: "Hallow yourselves and be holy, because I am Yahweh your God.[37] You shall keep my rules and obey them: I am Yahweh who hallows you." In H, where twelve instances of the כרת punishment are to be found, the command is enjoined time after time with the almost monotonous formula: "I am Yahweh" (40 times).[38] Even outside H we meet this formula in כרת passages (Ex. 12:12; 31:13).

The formula appears in two variations, אני יהוה and אני יהוה אלהיכם. In H we find the longer formula in the historical frames, while the shorter one occurs in the law passages. Here K. Elliger maintains that the two formulas represent different theological motifs. "Auf den theologischen Kern gesehen, ist die Selbstaussage 'Ich bin Jahwe' also kurz als Heiligkeits- oder Hoheitsformel, ihr Gegenstück 'Ich bin Jahwe, euer Gott' als Heilsgeschichts- oder Huldformel zu bezeichnen. Mit der notwendigen Vorsicht könnte man sagen: Die erste ist Gesetz, die zweite Evangelium."[39]

The shorter formula, which according to Elliger should be linked to the theology of holiness and thus be of a more legal character, occurs twice in direct connection with the כרת punishment (Ex. 31:13; Lev. 22:3). The longer formula which should be redemptive and evangelical, occurs also twice in direct connection with כרת.

One of the two last-mentioned passages is Lev. 20:7f, which was quoted earlier. Here the longer formula is tied directly to an expression of holiness. It seems to me to be quite unreasonable to call a word like this either law or gospel. It is naturally both of these things. Yahweh has hallowed Israel. But this sanctification includes a demand: You must be holy. The demand to cut off the one who is unworthy is, even in this instance, centered round the thought of the holiness of God and of Israel.

The other passage is Lev. 18:30. Here the formula is included in a discussion of sexual sins. It says that these defile the land and will cause Israel to be spewn out. The formula "I am Yahweh" can in all likelihood be understood as an expression of holiness even here. The people must be holy, because Yahweh their God is holy.

In any case, as the texts are now - and as they were at the beginning of the Christian Era - they give the impression that the כרת punishment consistently was motivated by the thought of Israel's holiness. Let me exemplify this by briefly going through the different types of offences.

He who offers to Molech, "thus making my sanctuary unclean and profaning my holy name", must be cut off (Lev. 20:3). Behind this lies the notion that uncleanness, like holiness, is contagious, and it is dangerous to bring the one in connection with the other. Through his idol worship the sinner has contracted the uncleanness which radiated from the idol. In the first place, he contaminates his relatives. That is why the whole family has to be cut off. Secondly, he contaminates the sanctuary when he takes part in the religious services of the Israelites. Its holiness has been defiled, and the carrier of impurity therefore has to be cut off.

The one who commits ritual offences must be cut off because he breaks the holy rules. The holy ointment and the holy incense must not be used on profane people or for profane purposes. "It is holy, and you shall treat it as holy" (Ex. 30:32, 38; cf. Lev. 19:8; Num. 19:13, 20).

The fact that those who commit sexual sins must be cut off is motivated, as has just been pointed out, by the fact that they are unclean and contaminate the land.

That he who sins willfully must be cut off is, according to Num. 15:30f, motivated by the fact that he is deriding Yahweh, disdaining Him and breaking His law. But after a parenthetical example the holiness motif returns in full strength: "that you remember all my commandments and obey them, and keep yourselves holy, consecrated to your God. I am Yahweh, your God who brought you out of Egypt to become your God. I am Yahweh your God." Even here it is the holiness motif which motivates the expulsion from Israel, though it is less immediate.[40]

The motivations associated with the ארור formulas in Deut. have completely different accentuations. We have seen that the ritual deviations are missing here whereas the social crimes are stressed. This in itself suggests that the concepts behind these rules do not stem from the thought of the community's holiness. Furthermore, we have seen that the curses in Deut. 27 and 28 are very closely connected with the covenant. The ארור formulas act as אלות, that is to say, as surities that the juridical agreement shall be kept. He who breaks any of the laws connected with the covenant automatically brings down over his head all the misfortunes which had been called down in the form of conditional self-cursing when the covenant was entered into. In Deut. 27:9 the covenant is proclaimed: "Be silent Israel, and listen; this day you have become a people belonging to Yahweh your God". From this fact the command is derived: "Obey Yahweh your God, and observe his commandments and statutes which I lay upon you this day". The curses follow on immediately after this. This thought is repeated in Chapt. 28:1, 15, 45, 58. It is a matter of hearing the voice of God, and obeying the commandments given at the making of the covenant, or else the result will be a curse, misfortune and eventual destruction.

One could think that the formula "You must get rid of the wickedness" is most closely associated with the holiness motif. Is it not here a question of the people keeping themselves pure and thrusting out those that are unclean so that the impurity will not spread? Four factors point in another direction.

First of all there is the matter of the ritual offences being absent, as in the curse formulas.

Furthermore, in four of the cases where the formula is used, the aim of the punishment is given. The aim is not to keep Israel the people pure but to deter further criminal acts. With few variations the recurring phrase reads: "All Israel shall hear of it and be afraid; never again will

anything as wicked as this be done among you" (Deut. 13:12; cf. 17:13; 19:20; 21:21). This expulsion from the community has no cleansing effect in itself. But it is aimed at frightening Israel and bringing her back to obedience of the laws of the covenant.

Thirdly, the word הרע, "the wickedness" refers to the criminal act, and not to the criminal himself. The word is used in Deut. 22:21, even though the offender in that case is a woman, and in Deut. 22:24, where it is a question of several offenders. The act is classified in stereo-typed phrases which lend weight to the judgment sentence. "If the report proves to be true, and it is shown that this abominable thing (תועבה) has been done in Israel" (17:4), "and the man who acts in presumptuousness (זדון)" (17:12), "she has committed an outrage (נבלה) in Israel" (22:21) or simply, "never again will anything as wicked as this (כדבר הרע) be done among you" (13:12; 19:20).

תועבה is admittedly a typical word for strong ritual uncleanness. But here the concentration on the act is unmistakeable. The offender must be killed, not because he is contaminated by impurity, but because he has committed a wrong act, an act which is contrary to the covenant.

Lastly, Deut. 13:6 expressly states the motivation for the בערת formula, a motivation which is not associated with the categories of holiness, but which shows clearly what kind of deviation the crime displays, disobediance, or rather encouragement to disobedience. The heathen priest and visionary must be killed, "for he has preached rebellion against Yahweh your God who brought you out of Egypt and redeemed you from that land of slavery, he has tried to lead you astray from the path which Yahweh your God commanded you to take. You must rid yourself of this wickedness." Not uncleanness but "leading astray" is the deciding factor. The motivation can appropriately be contrasted with the motivation for the כרת punishment and for other similar offences in Lev. 20:3: "making my sanctuary unclean and profaning my holy name".

However, in a couple of passages we meet concepts which are more reminiscent of what we found with the כרת punishment. This is namely when the בערת formula reads: "You must rid Israel of the guilt of innocent blood" (Deut. 19:13) or "You must rid yourself of the guilt of innocent blood" (Deut. 21:9). Both passages lay down how one should act in the event of a murder.

19:13. If a murderer flees to one of the free cities, the elders must hand him over to the avenger of blood. The thought is that the crime of shedding innocent blood (דם הנקי) in some way lives on and must be cleared if the guilt is not to rest over Israel. "If a blood outrage has been brought into the world, the deed besits the doer like an evil poison and makes inroads upon his soul. And, according to the fundamental psychic rule, the guilt spreads from him to be borne by his whole family."[41] The background reminds one of the holiness theology, but is more specific: the thought of blood guilt and the collective responsibility of the family and the nation.

21:1-9. If the perpetrator of a murder is unknown, the elders of the nearest city have to break the neck of a heifer and wash their hands over it. In this way the blood guilt can be wiped out, even though the murderer gets off free, "You shall rid yourself of the guilt of innocent blood." This passage is an undeniable reminder of the rules for those who had to purify themselves to avoid being cut off when they had become unclean (eg. Num. 19). But here the thought seems to be different. No measures are prescribed for preventing the mixing of the clean and the unclean. The feature which is typical of the holiness motif, namely that both holiness and uncleanness are contagious, is missing. This rite does not work automatically, and its effect is not described as that of cleansing. It is followed by a prayer requesting that Yahweh himself will step in, not to cleanse or sanctify Israel, but to "expiate" the guilt, or "cover" it (כפר). And, in the prayer it refers to the fact that Yahweh had earlier redeemed (פדה) his people (21:8), an expression which in Deut. refers to the deliverance from Egypt (Deut. 9:26; 13:6).[42]

The main impression remains: The Old Testament utterances about expulsion from Israel are associated with two principally different motifs. The one motif is built on the concept that life is divided up into areas which are of varying degrees of holiness. Yahweh is holiest, next come places, things, time periods or people which are particularly close to Yahweh, next comes Israel as a whole, next (so to say below zero) come foreign peoples, and last come their idols, whose uncleanness is just as active, just as contagious and dangerous as Yahweh's holiness. These areas must not be intermixed in such a way that that which is of a lower holiness order comes in contact with that which is of a higher order. The life of the community should be patterned after the rule: The holy belongs to the holy. If anyone breaks these regulations, he must either be cleansed or, in more serious cases, be expelled. This motif is expressed in P in the rules about the כרת punishment.

The other motif arises out of the covenant between God and Israel. In this covenant Israel's obligations are laid down. The covenant is, in the customary manner, endorsed with blessings and curses. He who does not observe and obey the laws of the covenant has thereby broken the covenant and thus no longer stands under God's protection. He is given over to the curse, to misfortune, and in the last extreme, death. This motif is expressed in Deut. with the ארור and the בערת formulas.

The contrast between these two motifs is in no way complete. Even the holiness law refers to the making of the covenant at Sinai (Lev. 26:46). The whole of Lev. 26 acts as a counterpart to the curses in Deut. 28, now with particular stress on the sabbath commandment.[43] Also, Deut. stresses that Israel is a people sanctified by Yahweh (Deut. 26:19). However, principally they are different motifs. We have seen that they are associated with different expressions for expulsion and that they dominate different strata within the OT. When the question of membership

was brought to a head and it was a case of deciding in what extreme cases a person was considered to have forfeited his standing as a member of God's people, then the basic intentions came to light.

In summing up I would like to define the similarities and differences between the two motifs, with reference to their influence on expulsion.

Firstly, God's activity constitutes the basis for membership in the community, according to both motifs. It is Yahweh who has delivered Israel from Egypt, entered into a covenant with her and sanctified her. Israel, for her part, had to observe the covenant obligations and behave in such a way as to be "worthy of" the holiness if she wanted to remain in the fellowship.

Secondly, in the OT both motifs are more directed towards the people of Israel than against particular Israelites. God has sanctified his people. God has made a covenant with his people. The religious community includes, in principle, the people as a whole. Connected with this, expulsion and death as a rule coincide - either in that one put the deviator to death, or that the execution of the punishment is transferred to a higher power. Only in Ezra 10:8 and in Neh. 13:3 do we find expulsion as an independent sanction.

The motifs also have characteristics which differentiate them. It is typical of the holiness motif that it is the ritual norms that are stressed. Even deviations from other types of norms can be described by the holiness motif - for example, sexual offences are considered as defiling. The holiness concept can be personalized in different ways, but it still seems to imply the thought that certain phenomena or things, because of their nature, are evil, and that one must protect oneself from them by means of ritual proceedings.

Furthermore, the concept that that which is evil, "the unclean", contaminates, is also typical of the holiness motif. This results in outward safety measures for protecting the community becoming of proportionately large importance. Certain contacts are felt to be full of risks, others to be safe. Deviation is described with words which stress the outward relationship rather than the inward.

The holiness motif also tends to the erection of a social structure in the community. Defilement can be gradated. There are things which are holy, and things which are holier than holy. Therefore, within the community, a holy order, a hierarchy, is developed, in which the priests occupy the foremost place. The story of the Kohathites (Num. 4:4ff, see above page 18f) illustrates the connection between this structure and the holiness motif. (Another obvious example is the temple in Jerusalem with its concentrically constructed courts. The holier one is, the farther in towards the most holy one was allowed to go.)

In connection with this, the limits of the community can be conceived as differentiated, if one refers to the holiness motif. We have

seen that expulsion in the OT was usually understood to be death. Meanwhile, in P there are also instructions about lower degrees of impurity, which do not immediately lead to death, but which can lead to it if cleansing measures are not taken (e.g. Num. 19:20). Here we find obvious possibilities for developing, in connection with the holiness motif, detailed rules for temporary and partial expulsions, for moving someone up or down the various degrees of membership. We will see below how these possibilities were exploited in Qumran.

Finally, the holiness motif gives an emotional picture of the community. The features mentioned earlier, when taken all together, arouse strongly emotional attitudes between the members of the community themselves and towards those who are not members. Those who stand without are not thought of as neutral but as of being controlled by an active impurity. The "destruction" of those who have contact with other gods is an expression of this emotional attitude.

The covenant motif, unlike the holiness motif, is not in itself tied to any specific type of norm, due to the fact that "covenant", as a formal concept, can be associated with a varied content. Thus, which deviations should be considered as leading to expulsion is not decided by the fact that the covenant motif is used, but by the actual covenant regulations. Nevertheless, we have seen that in Deut., when the covenant motif is used in connection with expulsion, the social norms are stressed, while the ritual norms are missing.

According to the covenant motif, participation in the community is dependent on mans free choice. The community is established at a liturgical ceremony, in which Israel collectively, it is true, chooses to enter into the covenant and expressly ratify this choice by cursing those who break the covenant agreement. If the holiness motif stresses the outward relationships, the covenant motif stresses the inward. Membership implies an inward personal decision (Ex. 24:3, 7; Deut. 30:19).

In this connection the limits of the community can be conceived as absolute, as a definable line. Either one keeps the covenant or one does not. It is difficult to associate partial expulsions with the covenant motif. A result of this is that expulsion and withdrawal cannot clearly be separated. He who breaks the covenant has actually left the community which Yahweh has blessed, of his own accord.

The concept that the covenant can be renewed is also typical of the covenant idea. At times the people of the covenant, according to the OT, seem to be an ideal quantity. The national misfortunes which befell the people are interpreted as curses which the people have brought on themselves by their breaking of the covenant. That is why confession of sin and prayer for forgiveness was a regular feature of covenant renewals.[44] In this sense the covenant motif is more closely connected with the thought of a personal, forgiving God than is the holiness motif.

The question of how the holiness motif and the covenant motif

came into being, how they varied in Old Testament times, how they developed and combined, is not within our purpose to answer. It is enough to ascertain here that both these motifs are found, relatively distinctly, in the OT, and that they are associated with different expressions for expulsion. In the following chapters we will see to what extent the Qumran Sect, Rabbinic Judaism, and Primitive Christianity took advantage of these motifs, or attached themselves to new ones, when they drew up their rules for expulsion.

Notes to Chapter I

1) The headings of the two sections have a slightly different meaning in this chapter and in the following chapters. Here I inquire into deviations and motifs in the OT. There I inquire into deviations, practices and motifs in the factual historical communities. I mark the difference by the use of different tenses. In Chap. I, I inquire into which deviations according to the OT lead to expulsion. In Chap. II, I inquire into which deviations led to expulsion from the actual community.

A problem is how one should define "the OT as it existed at the beginning of the Christian Era". The OT canon was, after all, not laid down until the end of the first century A.D. As the Pentateuch, the Torah, was the most important authority for the three communities we are interested in, it is chiefly there we will look for OT background material.

2) Among these texts we find the מות ימות passages (Ex. 19:12; 21:12, 15ff; 22:18; 31:14f; Lev. 20:2, 9-13, 15f, 27; 24:16f; 27:29; Num. 15:35; 35:16ff, 21, 31; Judg. 21:5; Ezek. 18:13). It is, admittedly, disputed whether these passages refer to the death penalty. A. Alt, Ursprünge, 308ff, reckoned them as an apodictic right, which has been understood in such a way as to have nothing to do with the ordinary administration of the law. Against this H. J. Boecker, Redeformen, 144, maintains that a court, with these clauses, laid down the death penalty. The latest investigation, H. Schulz, Todesrecht, denotes the formula as a "Todesdeklaration", a court sentence which does not directly refer to legal consequences, but which declares a man, who has deviated from a definite system of norms, to be given over to death. Other opinions are reported by Schulz on p. 77f note 315. As far as we are concerned the question is not decisive. The מות ימות passages are distributed over the same types of deviations as the other texts about the death penalty.

For the death penalty, see R. de Vaux, Institutions I, 244f.

De Vaux counts "destroying" as a death penalty. We consider these texts in a specific context in point 4.

3) Bible quotations are usually given according to the New English Bible.

4) W. Gesenius, Handwörterbuch, 364f; L. Koehler, Lexicon, 456ff.

5) O. Eissfeldt, Einleitung, 250f.

6) Nifal: Gen. 17:14; Ex. 12:15, 19; 30:33, 38; 31:14; Lev. 7:20f, 25, 27; 17:4, 9, 14; 18:29; 19:8; 20:17f; 22:3; 23:29; Num. 9:13; 15:30f; 19:13, 20; Zech. 13:8; Ps. 37:9, 22; Prov. 2:22.

7) Hifil with God as the subject: Lev. 17:10; 20:3, 5; 1 Sam. 2:33; 1 Kings 9:7; 14:10; 21:21; 2 Kings 9:8; Isa. 9:13; Ezek. 14:8; Zeph. 1:4; Mal. 2:12.
Hifil infinitive, with God as the logical subject: Isa. 48:9; Jer. 44:7f, 11.

8) Hifil with human subject: Num. 4:18 (doubtful, cf. W. Zimmerli, Eigenart, 15f); 1 Sam. 28:9; 1 Kings 14:14 (doubtful). W. Zimmerli, Eigenart, 19, characterizes the הכרית formula as a curse formula which states that a person has been thrust out from the people of the covenant. H. Reventlow, Heiligkeitsgesetz, 38, and R. Kilian, Untersuchung, 11f, concur with Zimmerli. It seems accurate to say that the actual expelling from the community is seen as God's activity. But the "covenant curse" constitutes a more distinct genre, not applicable here.

9) W. Zimmerli, Eigenart, 19.

10) M. Tsevat, Studies, 195-201.

11) W. Gesenius, Handwörterbuch, 84f; L. Koehler, Lexicon, 109; W. Baumgartner, Lexikon, 106.

12) N. H. Snaith, Ideas, 32-34. "One god's qodesh was another god's cherem", p. 33. See also H. Ringgren, Holiness, 12f.

13) W. Gesenius, Handwörterbuch, 259f; W. Baumgartner, Lexikon, 339f.

14) F. Horst, Recht, 162. G. v. Rad, Theologie I, 355.

15) S. Bialoblocki, Cherem, 412: "Diese Art des Cherem ist späterhin in der jüd. Rechtspflege als schweres Strafmittel gebräuchlich geworden, nur dass man sich im Laufe der Zeit mit dem Ausschluss aus der jüd. Gemeinschaft begnügt hat."

16) C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 5ff. The word seems in the main to have gone through three stages: a) = committed to destruction, b) = votive gift, c) = banished.

17) J. E. Mignard, Discipline, 13f, describes חרם as "a curse", which is not quite correct.

18) See J. Pedersen, Eid; J. Hempel, Anschauungen; J. Scharbert, Fluchen; H. C. Brichto, Problem; J. Scharbert, TWAT I, 279-285 and 437-451, where literature is listed. A research survey by W. Schottroff, Fluchspruch, 9-24.

19) As a verb, 6 times: qal: Judg. 17:2, Hos. 4:2; 10:4. Hifil: 1 Sam. 14:24; 1 Kings 8:31; 2 Chron. 6:22. As a noun, 36 times.

20) H. C. Brichto, Problem 70.

21) J. Scharbert, TWAT I, 279.

22) J. Scharbert, Fluchen, 5: "Aus den dargelegten Zusammenhängen ersehen wir, dass אלה immer nur einen Fluch zur Sicherung von Eigentum, Anordnungen, Gesetzen, Verträgen oder zur Bestätigung von Aussagen bei Gericht meint."

23) The same applies to Saul's curse in 1 Sam. 14:24ff. The curse worked even before the people took action against Jonathan. See J. Pedersen, Eid, 74f.

24) G. E. Mendenhall, Forms; K. Baltzer, Bundesformular; D. J. Mc Carthy, Treaty.

25) K. Baltzer, Bundesformular, 24f. Survey in tabular form in D. J. Mc Carthy, Treaty, 50.

26) Deut. 29:11, 13, 18, 19, 20; Ezek. 16:59; 17:13, 16, 19; Zech. 5:3; Dan. 9:11; 2 Chron. 34:24.

27) J. Pedersen, Eid, 68.

28) J. Pedersen, Eid, 78f.

29) Cf. J. E. Mignard, Discipline, 18.

30) H. C. Brichto, Problem 114.

31) J. Scharbert, Fluchen, 5f, unites both meanings. Cf. W. Schottroff, Fluchspruch, 9f, 30-35.

32) G. v. Rad, Deuteronomium, 120.

33) E. Jenni, Pi'el, 41ff.

34) J. Scharbert, Fluchen, 8f; H. C. Brichto, Problem 176f.

35) See further, J. Scharbert, Fluchen, 14f.

36) W. Gesenius, Handwörterbuch, 108. L. Koehler, Lexicon, 139f, develops the meaning "remove" via "clear (land)" and "clean" from "kindle", "burn down". The last meaning Gesenius asigns to another verb with the same radicals. W. Baumgartner, Lexikon, 140, again differentiates between the two words, one with the meaning (qal) "burn" and (piel) "kindle", the other with the meaning (piel) "crop", "devastate", "remove", "exterminate".

37) Or with LXX: "because I Yahweh your God am holy", cf. v. 26.

38) For the formulas "I am Yahweh", "I am Yahweh your God", see W. Zimmerli, Ich bin Jahwe; K. Elliger, Ich bin der Herr - euer Gott; K. Elliger, Leviticus, 237f.

39) K. Elliger, Ich bin der Herr - euer Gott, 15.

40) Only in Gen. 17:14 is the כרת punishment motivated by the fact that the covenant has been broken. Note that it is a question of a ritual offence. He who does not circumcise himself has broken the covenant and must be cut off.

41) J. Pedersen, Israel I-II, 327, cf. 309, 331.

42) But in Num. 35:33 the thought of blood guilt and the thought of uncleanness are connected.

43) Because of the likeness between Lev. 26 and Deut. 28 H. Reventlow, Heiligkeitsgesetz, 30 et passim, sees in the Holiness Code a liturgy for the Old-Israelite covenant feast. R. Kilian, Untersuchungen, 162f, polemizes against Reventlow, and sees in Lev. 26 a Levite sermon, inspired by Deut, and the Ezekiel tradition.

44) K. Baltzer, Bundesformular, 48-70.

II. Expulsion from the Religious Community within the Qumran Sect

Ever since the discovery of the first Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947, the Jewish Qumran Sect has attracted an enormous amount of attention.[1] The finds give evidence of a group of people who believed that they constituted the true Israel, and who more or less completely separated themselves from their Jewish brethren. The Sect can with considerable accuracy be dated from the period beginning in the middle of the second century B.C. up until the year 68 A.D.[2]

But, who actually belonged to this community? Some of the members lived in a cloister in Qumran a life similar to that of a holy order.[3] The Manual of Discipline seems designed for regulating life inside this branch of the community. The Damascus Document reflects a branch which is more society orientated and which - if one can take its words literally - lived in Damascus.[4] And, if it is true that the community's members were Essenes, we can learn from Josephus and Philo that some of them lived in small groups all round Palestine. Finally, a Jewish order outside Alexandria, the Therapeutae, has also been linked with the Qumran Sect.[5]

That the community which the Damascus Document describes was closely connected with Qumran is evident just from the fact that fragments of the document were found there. Whether the brothers of the sect were Essenes is, admittedly, much debated, but most experts agree that they were. On the other hand it is difficult to prove any direct points of contact between the Therapeutae and Qumran. Therefore, I will in future include only the following in the Qumran Sect: a) the actual holy order by the Dead Sea, b) the more open community reflected in the Damascus Document, and c) the Essenes as portrayed by the classical sources. I thus leave aside the Therapeutae.

Most of our information about expulsion from the religious community, we find in the sect's own writings. We will concentrate on the following documents:

a. The Manual of Discipline

The main text is the scroll found in the first cave, which is usually termed 1QS.[6] But, a series of fragments from other caves should also be taken into consideration. In cave four, fragments of ten manuscripts

have been found, which in a good many points differ from 1QS. The most important variants have been listed by J. T. Milik.[7] One fragment from cave five (5Q 11) reproduces sections of the text in 1QS II 4-7, 12-14 without any differences worth our noting.[8] 5Q 13:4 quotes from 1QS III 4-5.[9]

b. The Damascus Document

The text became known as early as 1910 through S. Schechter's edition, CD.[10] But several fragments having been found in Qumran, it is now usually considered as a document of the Qumran Sect. There are seven fragments from cave four which, as far as I know, are unpublished, but we have some interesting information about two of them ($4QD^b$ and $4QD^e$).[11] One fragment has been published from cave five (5Q 12) which is the equivalent of CD IX 7-10, but which - in accordance with $4QD^e$, as reported - implies that there was another text before CD IX 7.[12] Five fragments from cave six have been published.[13] Four have no information of value to us. The fifth has no equivalent in CD but it is assumed that it should be placed before CD XII 1.[14] It deals with sexual offences.

c. The Rule of the Congregation[15]

This document (1QSa) describes a kind of community which has never existed in reality, the eschatological congregation, "the community of Israel at the end of time".[16] But this eschatological body was doubtless considered as a pattern for the concrete community which produced the document. It agrees with the Damascus Document on several points.

According to reports, four other manuscripts have been found in cave four, with legal instructions, for the most part concerning purity. One of them is a list of pronounced legal sentences.[17] But these manuscripts are not published.

Of the ancient texts about the Essenes there is mainly one which deals with our subject: Josephus, De Bello Judaico II 119-161.[18]

As mentioned these texts reflect different branches within the sect. The main stream of scholars date both the Manual and the Damascus Document as belonging to an early phase of the history of the sect, the second century B.C., the Damascus Document possibly being somewhat later.[19] The Rule should be about contemporaneous with the Manual, to which it is a supplement.[20] Josephus' description of the Essenes covers the final phase of the sect, the middle of the first century of the Christian Era.[20a]

In handling the texts we must bear in mind that they represent

different periods and different branches of the sect. It is also likely that neither the Manual nor the Damascus Document constitute a uniform work.[21] We have to count on the possibility of finding traces in, for example, the Manual, of a development within the sect.

A. Which Deviations Led to Expulsion?

In the OT we found five types of deviation which could lead to expulsion: idolworship, disobedience, sexual, ritual and social offences. We also found characteristic variations concerning these deviations. Expressions associated with the holiness motif stressed the ritual norms, and expressions associated with the covenant motif stressed the social norms.

It will be interesting to see now what stand the Qumran texts take on these types of deviation. On which points was one so sensitive that one wanted to thrust out a deviator?

1. That idolworship in its true meaning, i.e. the invoking of idols or strange gods, was not compatible with membership was so obvious in Qumran that it did not need to be pointed out. Therefore we can see how the OT texts were given a new interpretation. In Deut. 29, the passage about the covenant in the land of Moab, the children of Israel are threatened with the covenant curses if they should rise up and worship other gods. Here it is a question of very tangible gods of "wood and stone, of silver and gold" (v. 16). 1QS II 11-17 takes up this section and exploits it (particularly Deut. 29:9-20) in connection with the sect's covenant renewal feast.[22] But the meaning is different now. The text reads:

> Cursed (ארור) be he who with the idols of his heart comes to enter[23] into this covenant and puts the stumbling-block of his sin before him[24] so that he backslides through it. And when he hears[25] the words of this covenant, he blesses himself in his heart saying: "Peace be to me, for I walk in the stubbornness of my heart" - may his spirit be destroyed, the thirst with the saturation, without forgiveness. God's anger and the zeal of his judgements shall flame up (בער) against him unto eternal destruction. All the curses (אלות) of this covenant shall stick to him and God will separate him (בדל) for evil, and he will be cut off (כרת) from all the children of light, because he backslides from God with his idols and the stumbling-block of his sin. He will place his lot among the eternally cursed. And all who enter into the covenant answer and say after them: "Amen, amen".

Here it is no longer a question of tangible gods. The curse will affect the one who falls away from the norms of the sect in whatever way this may happen. In Deut. 29 idolworship in its literal meaning is a sign that the covenant is broken. In 1QS II, on the contrary, the falling away from the covenant is a sign of idolworship in a transferred meaning, for which reason the curses in Deut. 29 can be applicable.

1QS IV 5 mentions abhorrance of "unclean idols" as a suitable attitude for members, but even here the concept seems to be spiritualized, as it is mentioned in the same breath as "love for all the children of truth and glorious purity"[26] and "walking with reservation".

The same is the case in CD XX 8-13. Those who "have set idols upon their heart" can have no part in "the house of Torah". Neither is it here a question of literal idol worship, but of people who "spoke error against the righteous ordinances and despised the covenant and compact which they established in the land of Damascus, which is the 'new covenant'".[27] Idol worship is the same as despising the laws of the sect.

2. Open defiance of God, also disqualifies one from membership of the Qumran Sect. Even here the OT material is used in a specific way. He who sins "with lifted hand" shall, according to Num. 15:27-31, be cut off, because he is scorning Yahweh, despising his word and breaking his law. In 1 QS V 11f the expression is used of those who break the Torah as it is written in the law of Moses.[28] He who transgresses against this revealed law will be hit by the covenant curses because his offence is considered to be conscious and intentional. In the same way, 1 QS VIII 16ff prescribes that he who breaks the law of Moses intentionally, "with lifted hand", must be expelled till he has reformed, whereas VIII 22ff and IX 1 gives definite expulsion as the consequence.[29]

According to CD X 2f, he who breaks one of the laws "with lifted hand" is denied the right to witness until he has purified himself. Members of the sect do not "lift the hand" against God's holy law and righteous rules (CD XX 30f). Thus the OT commandment is used with a certain shift of meaning. The stress now lies more on the transgression of certain fixed commandments, than on the open contempt of Yahweh. An observation by Josephus bears this out. He states that the Essenes reverenced the name of their lawgiver next to that of God, and that he who reviles it was condemned to death (Bellum II 145), a rule which goes beyond the OT and shows how reverence for the law was intensified.[30]

3. The attitude of the Qumran Sect to sexuality is much debated.[31] The situation is as follows. The Manual contains no information on either celibacy or marriage. (But this silence can be interpreted in various ways.[32]) The Damascus Document presumes marriage for those who "live in camps according to the rule of the land", CD VII 6. (But the

document seems to contrast this group with another who "walk in holy perfection", CD VII 4f.[33]) Even the Rule of the Congregation (e.g. 1QSa I 4) and the War Scroll (e.g. 1QM VII 3) take marriage for granted. (But can these texts be utilized to give information of the actual conditions of the sect?) Pliny, Philo and Josephus all mention that the Essenes lived as celibates.[34] (But, Josephus also mentions another section which considered marriage as a duty.[35])

Thus, the situation is not particularly clear. But, seeing the various documents describe different branches of the community and belong to different periods of time, there is no reason for trying to combine them into a uniform picture.[36]

Sexual deviations do not, in the Manual, play a particularly great role in the reasons for expulsion. It is possible that the rules in 1QS VII 12-14 are directed against homosexual tendencies.[37] On the other hand, in the Damascus Document it is expressly stated that one of the conditions of membership is that one has to abstain "according to the rule" from sexual offences (CD VII 1f; cf. IV 17, 20f; V 7-11; VIII 5-7; XII 1f).[38] 6QD[e] (No. 15:5) takes up the prohibition in Lev. 20:13, among others, against male homosexuality and seems to describe such as a breaking of the covenant. 4Q 159 decrees more clearly that serious sexual offences should be punished by death.[39]

4. Ritual norms play a large part throughout Qumran. He who enters into the sect takes it upon himself to keep away from "the men of deceit" (1QS V 10). One must not have fellowship with such people on the question of the Purity, economy, interpretation of the law, and the Drink (1QS V 13ff. For terminology see p. 55ff). Even according to CD VI 15ff the members of the sect have to separate themselves from "the children of perdition". They have to renounce unclean wealth, they have to separate between clean and unclean, between profane and holy. The "holy spirit" of the members must not be sullied (VII 3f). More detailed instruction as to how one was to deal with gentiles so as not to profane the holy is given in CD XII 6-11. Ritual rules regarding foods, tools etc. are formulated in CD XII 12-20. Even here the concluding motivation reads: "to distinguish between the clean and the unclean, and to make known the distinction between the holy and the profane".

In which instances are ritual offences given as reasons for expulsion?

a. 1QS VII 1f prescribes that he who blasphemes God because he is in distress, or for any other reason, while he is reading from the Book (Torah) or pronouncing blessings, shall be totally and definitely expelled. The passage seems to refer to a member who takes part in certain of the functions in the religious services. It is hardly conceivable that the offence would occur while a service was in progress.[40] The thought is

rather this, that he who is set apart to fulfil a specific liturgical duty for a certain period of time is, during this period, holy and therefore must be particularly careful in his speech. It is a particularly serious sin to blaspheme God during this period of duty. He who commits this sin must be sent away, and never be allowed to return.[41]

b. According to CD XII 4-6, he who desecrates the sabbath and the festivals is not to be killed, "for it falls to men to guard him, and if he is healed from it, they shall guard him for a period of seven years, and afterwards he shall come into the assembly". On the one hand, this punishment is milder than that in the OT, where sabbath-breaking entailed the death penalty. On the other hand, the detailed sabbath rules in CD X 14-XI 18, reveal the importance one placed on the sabbath commandment. Several of the regulations show a stricter observance than was usual among the Jews at that time.[42] Sabbath observance in these circles is also evident from the fact that the Book of Jubilees, of which at least ten fragments have been found in Qumran, lays down the death penalty for the one who in some way breaks the sabbath, and even for the one who just talks of doing so. Even Josephus certifies that the sabbath observance of the Essenes exceeded that of other Jews. "For not only do they prepare their food on the day before to avoid kindling a fire on that one, but they do not venture to remove any vessel or even to go to stool" (Bellum II 147ff).[43] In spite of the milder punishment in CD, it is therefore still evident that the Qumran Sect laid unusually great importance on the sabbath commandment.

The reason for this seems to be that the sabbath commandment was considered as a sign which separated Israel from the surrounding nations (e.g. Jub. 2:31). As the only true Israel, the members of the Qumran Sect now had to have a sabbath observance which separated them not only from the gentiles but also from the rest of Israel. That is why the sabbath was considered as belonging to the holy secret things which God revealed to the remnant of his people when, after Israel's apostasy, he renewed the covenant with the faithful (CD III 14).

c. He who was totally expelled from the sect was considered as unclean as a leper. "Unclean, unclean shall he be all the days he repudiates the rules" it says, alluding to Lev. 13:45 (1QS III 5). Now if a member entered into fellowship with him on the question of Purity or property, the same judgement would befall him. He had to be expelled apparently because he had been contaminated by the uncleanness (1QS VII 25).

d. Hippolyte maintains that a certain group of Essenes threatened to murder people if they did not circumcise themselves (Ref. 26:2). However, Hippolyte identifies these with the Zealots, which makes his information unrealiable. Circumcision does not play such a deciding role

in the Qumran texts. It is mentioned a few times, but then in a figurative sense (1QS V 5, 1QpHab. IX 13) or in referring to Abraham's circumcision (CD XVI 6).[44]

The three clear cases, a, b and c, in which expulsion follows on ritual offences, affect consequently, all laws which are intended to preserve the holiness of the sect and of its members.

5. Social obligations are stressed in the Qumran texts as they are in the OT. It was a matter of showing a loving manner towards others (1QS IV 2-6). He who wanted to be a member of the sect had to "love each man as himself; strengthen the hand of the poor, the needy and the proselyte,[45] and to seek the well-being of his brother" (CD VI 20-VII 1; cf. Lev. 19:18; Ezek. 16:49). According to Philo the community of the Essenes was characterized by their solicitude for the sick and the poor (Quod omnis 87, Def. 13). Josephus writes that it was considered a virtue among the Essenes to adopt small children (Bellum II 120), and that they showed hospitality towards all the brethren (Bellum II 124). This information agrees well with the regulations in CD XIV 13-16. which stated that two days' wages had to be levied for the benefit of the needy of all kinds.

But the brethren one had to love were those of the same faith. There was only one true attitude towards those who stood outside the limits of the community: "An eternal hate towards the men of perdition in a hidden spirit" (1QS IX 21f). The Damascus Document can seem less categorical. "Let no man put forth his hand to shed the blood of a man of the gentiles for the sake of property and gain; also let him not carry off anything of their property." But the following motivation is revealing: "in order that they may not blaspheme" (CD XII 6ff). Really, the pagans are not worth any love. But so as not to be the cause of their blaspheming and thus profaning God's name, it is wisest to refrain from the most serious crimes.

According to 1QS it was a case of suiting one's goodwill to the worth of each individual, even within the sect (1QS I 9f). Each one must be treated in accordance with his spiritual quality (e.g. 1QS IX 15f). Social obligations were thus subordinated to the hierarchical order of the sect.

It cannot be just a coincidence that clear rules for expulsion on the grounds of purely social offences are missing from the Qumran texts. Admittedly the Old Testament laws remained and were binding, but they were arranged under different motives which the members of the sect considered as more important. Love to one's neighbour was adjusted to the scale of value in which each person was considered to have his definite place. Love to one's neighbour was incorporated into the holy order.

That is why in the Manual we find a series of rules directed against specific kinds of transgressions. He who offends against the holy order, be it through disobedience, sexual offences, economic or

social crimes, must be punished. These offences can be called disciplinary offences.

6. Disciplinary offences are dealt with particularly in 1QS VI 24-VII 25. We have here a catalogue of punishments unique in the Qumran texts.[46] All the crimes numbered here have a clear connection with the disciplinary order in Qumran. Here punishment is prescribed for the one who will not humbly accept the chastisement from a superior, for the one who gets angry against the priest, for the one who misappropriates the property of the sect or for the one who disturbs or contaminates the meetings by interrupting the speaker, by falling asleep, by spitting or roaring with laughter. Josephus' description of the Essenes agrees very well with 1QS in this respect. "It is a point of honour with them to obey their elders, and a majority (τοῖς πλείοσιν);[47] for instance, if ten sit together one will not speak if the nine desire silence. They are careful not to spit into the midst of the company or to the right" (Bellum II 146f).

It can seem strange that the sect laid such importance on these details that it had to work out special rules with precise clauses for the punishment of each transgression. But the members of the sect did not think of them as details. They saw their sect as a holy community, with an order of precedence according to a fixed scale of values. Each departure from the order was felt to be a contamination of the holiness of the sect.

Below we will discuss the nature of the punishments which were meted out to protect the holiness of the sect. But we can already here note the fact that the stiffest punishment, total and definite expulsion, was reserved for five offences: a) that one at the same time as one functioned as a reader of the scriptures or a reciter of blessings in the holy meetings of the sect pronounced curses in a private case (1QS VII 1f); b) slandering "the Many" (1QS VII 16f); c) grumbling about the fundamentals of the sect (1QS VII 17); d) backsliding after ten years of membership in "the council of the community" (1QS VII 22ff); e) having contact with those who have been expelled (1QS VII 25). The line of the forgivable was definitely crossed with these offences. It is obvious what lay closest to the hearts of this group. Preserving the sect's order, purity and authority was the most important of all.

7. Conclusion. Which deviations led to expulsion? We have got about the same picture as that which in the OT was associated with the holiness motif. But certain shifts of emphasis are noticeable. The OT passages about idolworship were applied to revolt against the sect. Disobedience, intentional and conscious sin, was considered more as a transgression of the law than as contempt or scorn of God. The sexual norms are made more stringent in the Damascus Document and seem to lack topicality in

the Manual, which is most simply explained by the fact that the two documents represent different branches of the sect each with a different social structure. Ritual norms with the aim of keeping the sect pure, were protected by the threat of expulsion. According to the Manual and to Josephus the greatest importance was laid on discipline within the sect. On the other hand, social crimes are not mentioned as leading to expulsion. Concentration on the sect, its interpretation of the law, its holy structure, is clear.

B. How was Expulsion Carried Out?

Here I will try to present a picture of the outward course of events in connection with an expulsion. What did the reproof imply? Which court had to pass sentence? What consequences did expulsion have on the one affected, and which form did the expulsion take in the Qumran Sect?

1. Reproving. Reproof should be given in a brotherly and loving way. In Lev. 19:17 it says: "You shall not nurse hatred against your brother. You shall reprove your fellow-countryman frankly and so you will have no share in his guilt".

In post-exilic Judaism there developed, in connection with this word, an idea of the Jewish community being a kind of familia Dei in which one had to look after one another, provide for one another and if necessary, reprove one another in a loving and brotherly manner.[48]

This ideal was alive even in the Qumran Sect. We find a beautiful description of what reproof implies, in CD XX 15ff. It says that in the future God's anger will be kindled against Israel. "There will be no king and no ruler and no judge and none to reprove in righteousness. But they that turned from impiety of Jacob, the keepers of the covenant of God, will then speak each man to his fellow, to make each man his brother righteous, that their step may take hold of the way of God." The aim of reproof was positive, and it had its necessary place in the sect's picture of the ideal Israel.

1QS V 24-26 gives more direct instructions for the one who does the reproving. "One shall reprove, each man his neighbour, with truth and humility and affectionate love towards each man.[49] One must not speak to him in anger or with a grudge or with a stiff neck or with the zeal of an evil spirit."[50] This text gives evidence of a fairly good knowledge of human nature. One's duty to reprove entailed certain risks. A desire to criticize, devoid of love, and selfishness could easily disguise itself as moral piety. But this kind of jealousy, with grudges and a stiff neck, is not of the spirit of truth but of ungodliness. Reproof must be

given in brotherly love. Reproof is not in the first instance a punishment, but an effort to lead somebody right.

But, this loving reproof had its firm limits. Already the OT warns against reproving the ungodly (Prov. 9:7f). The Manual made a note of words like this. 1QS IX 16f prescribes for "the wise one": "He must not reprove or quarrel with men of perdition. And he shall reprove with true knowledge and righteous judgement those who choose the way, each according to his spirit and the order of the time." The words become incomprehensible if one understands reproof to be only a sanction. It was a privilege, a sign of brotherhood. But one was not allowed to show this mark of favour to those who stood outside the limits of the community. These one was supposed to hate. One was only allowed to reprove a brother of the community. And also this had to take place in agreement with each person's participation in the spirit of truth, as the order of the sect and the time demanded.

The Damascus Document has a milder attitude to those who stood outside the sect. CD XX 2ff tells how one should behave towards a member of "the men of holy perfection", "who was loth to carry out the commands of upright men", He must be thrust out "like one whose lot has not fallen in the midst of those taught of God. According to his sin shall men of knowledge reprove him, until the day when he shall again stand in the conclave of the men of holy perfection". Even after this expulsion, when all fellowship as regards economy and work had ceased and the one expelled was considered as being cursed of God and his angels - even then was reproof to continue in the hope that the sinner would return.

But in Qumran one went beyond this current Jewish community ideal. Reproof did not belong only to the private sphere of relationships but was also considered to be a necessary step in the formal expulsion procedure. Therefore, it was decreed that reproof in front of witnesses had to take place before each judicial measure. The Manual decrees: "And one must not take up a case against one's neighbour before the Many if it has not been preceded by reproof before witnesses" (1QS VI 1). And in CD IX 2, Lev. 19:18 is interpreted in the following way: "Every man of the members of the covenant who brings against his neighbour an accusation without reproving before witnesses and brings it up when he grows angry or tells his elders to make him contemptible, he is one who takes vengeance and bears rancour".

Thus, prosecution cannot be started before the reproving has taken place, and to confirm that this has taken place, it must be done in front of witnesses. The witnesses are not just witnessing the criminal act, but above all, they witness the reproving. We can assume that they take part in the reproving, warning and cautioning the sinner, in order to prevent a relapse.

However, the Old Testament regulations concerning witnesses

were not very clear. Deut. 17:6 required two or three witnesses in order that a death sentence could be passed. According to Deut. 19:15, each charge had to be decided on the evidence of two or three witnesses. These words give rise to two questions. a) Is the number of witnesses to differ in ordinary cases and in cases for capital punishment? b) If a man commits the same crime repeatedly, can you then add together one evidence from each individual incident and take the matter to court? Presumably it is these problems which lie behind the difficult passage CD IX 16ff.[51]

> As for everything which a man sins against the Torah, and his neighbour, being one alone, sees it: if it is a capital matter, then he (the witness) shall make it known in his (the culprit's) presence with reproving to the Overseer; and the Overseer shall write it down with his own hand, against the time that he might do it again before one person, and the latter will again inform the Overseer. And if then he is again apprehended before one person, his case is complete. But if they are two and they testify about another occasion,[52] let the man be set apart from the Purity only; provided they are reliable; and on the same day that the man sees it he shall make it known to the Overseer. And concerning property let them accept two reliable witnesses, and one witness suffices for setting apart from the Purity.

Here we find the answer to the two questions we had just assumed. a) Yes, a different number of witnesses is needed for different lawsuits. The following diagram is applicable:

	capital matter	concerning property
reproof	one witness	one witness
setting apart from the Purity	two witnesses	one witness
judgement	three witnesses	two witnesses

b) Yes you can combine evidence from different occasions and thus make a judgement possible.

This system, which seems to have no exact parallel in the rabbinic literature, brings certain practical consequences in its train.[53] Evidence had to be given before the Overseer, in order that an account could be kept. He had to note down the reproof so that it could be referred to if the crime was repeated. We will see later that Paul took up something of this custom.

As far as the witness was concerned, he had to be reliable (CD IX

21), he had to be old enough for full membership, i.e. 20 (CD X 1, cf. Ex. 30:14), he could not be unclean as a result of a conscious transgression (CD X 2f).

From the above-mentioned quotation from CD IX it is also clear that the reproving had to take place the same day on which one saw the crime committed (CD IX 22). Similarly CD VII 3 decrees, with reference to Lev. 19:17f, that a man shall reprove his brother and not bear a grudge from one day to the next.[54] CD IX 6ff states that the one who, on a question of a capital offence keeps quiet about it to his neighbour from one day to the next and then reports him in anger, he is breaking the commandment: "You shall reprove your fellow-countryman frankly and so you will have no share in his guilt" (Lev. 19:17).[55] Even 1QS V 26f should be interpreted in the light of this rule. "One must reprove him on the (same) day, so that one does not draw guilt over oneself."[56] The rule is motivated by the ambition to keep the sect clean from everything that could stain its holiness. Anger, irritability and a hard heart belonged to the spirit of perdition. A member of the sect was not allowed to harbour things like this. "No-one is allowed to contaminate his spirit of holiness" (CD VII 3f).

2. If reproof did not help, it could become necessary to punish, and in the last resort, expel the offender. But, which instance had to judge?

a. The first half of the Manual presupposes nothing but that the sect as a whole decided on questions of discipline. In III 6f it is laid down that the sect and its holy spirit had to decide if a backslider should be reinstated. V 3 dictates that the sons of Sadok and the assembly of the men of the sect had the right of decision as far as the Torah, property and law was concerned. V 7ff tells that one entered into the sect in the presence of all those who had joined of a free will. V 21f specifies: The sons of Aaron and the multitude of Israel must examine the novice with reference to insight and deeds. And finally VI 9 gives legal cases as one of the matters the Many (מושב הרבים) had to deal with.

But then the question becomes more complicated. 1QS VI 14 mentions an Examiner (האיש המפקיד) who tests the novice and instructs him before he is placed before the Many. It is possible that this is the same man which 1QS VI 12 calls Overseer (המבקר), a person who in CD XIII 7-17 has exactly this task and who in 1QS VI 20 notes down and presumably takes over the novice's property.

In 4QS^{g},[57] the words "at a joint investigation" are missing from the title which in 1QS VI 24 reads, "These are the regulations according to which one must judge at a joint investigation". This indicates that at least the one who wrote this fragment did not feel that the assistance of the Many was indispensable.

1QS VIII 1 mentions the much debated collegium of twelve men and three priests.[58] The question is, how much can one understand, from what 1QS VIII 1ff says, about the duties of this group.[59] The expression, "the council of the community" (עצת היחד) seems to refer to the whole fellowship.[60] The only thing that is clearly stated about this collegium was that its members had to be perfect in all things revealed in the whole of the Torah. But the corresponding collegium in CD X 1-10 and 4Q 159 had the duty to act as judges. Certain of the wording in 1QS VIII 1-10 implies the same thing,[61] even though it cannot be decided conclusively whether this is referring to the sect as a whole or only to the collegium.

However, 1QS IX 7 lays down a clear restriction of the power to judge. Only the sons of Aaron, the priests, can take a decision on law and property. This regulation stands in direct opposition to those in the first half of the scroll, e.g. V 3.

The simplest way of solving these difficulties is to assume that the latter half of the scroll reflects later conditions within the sect. The fact that the officials are not mentioned until VI 12 and onward, points in the same direction.[62] The sect which the Manual describes has obviously gone through a certain development in the field of consolidation and institutionalization, through which the power of judgement was concentrated in the priests. The text of the Manual seems to have grown alongside this development.

b. The Damascus Document gives the Overseer authority to examine the one who desires to join the sect (CD XIII 13, XV 7f), to note down reproofs (CD IX 18-22) and to receive prosecutions (CD XIV 11). He is responsible for the social welfare of the sect (CD XIV 13ff) and controls the economic relations of the members (CD XIII 15f). He is to instruct the Many, like a shepherd to lead back those who have been misled and to loosen the bonds of the oppressed (CD XIII 7ff). The duties of the Overseer seem to lie on the administrative and pastoral plane. On the other hand, he has no directly judicial tasks.[63]

The right to judge devolves upon a judicial collegium, six men and four priests, who are instructed in the "book of Hagu" and who are aged between 24 and 60. As judges these people had to approve witnesses (CD X 1-10), to supervise the taking of oaths (IX 10; XV 4), to deal out relief to the needy, together with the Overseer (XIV 13), and possibly to control admittance into the sect (XV 16).

c. The Rule of the Congregation even names the "judges" (1QSa I 15, 24, 29) among the other leaders and officials. One has to be 30 years old to be able to take charge of a lawsuit. It is not clear how many judges there were, or whether they formed a collegium.

d. Josephus' information about the Essenes agrees more with 1QS than with CD. "They are just and scrupulously careful in their trial of cases, never passing sentence in a court of less than a hundred members; the decision thus reached is irrevocable" (Bellum II 145).

To some extent, these differences in the statements concerning judicial instances can be explained by the sect's structure and its order at sessions.[64] On the one hand the unity of the sect is strongly emphasized. The members should together come to decisions on all questions. On the other hand, the members were not of equal merit. At sessions members who stood highest in rank, were allowed to speak first, and after that the rest in the proper order (1QS VI 8-13, CD XIV 5f). All could speak until a unanimous decision had been reached, doubtless one which was in agreement with the intention of the leaders. The members were to form a unity "with the Torah and the economy, submitting response according to the sons of Sadok, the priests who keep the covenant, and according to the Many of the men of the sect who hold fast to the covenant" (1QS V 2f).[65] Even if it was formally the Many who took a decision together, in practice it was the priests and the rest of the leaders who decided.

However, these facts cannot explain the strong contrast between 1QS V 3 (the Many judge) and 1QS IX 7 (the priests judge) or between 1QS VI 1 (the Many judge) and CD X 1 (the judges judge). We have to assume partly that CD is directed towards another more laymen-orientated branch of the sect than 1QS, partly that the development within the sect was towards a greater concentration of power in the hands of the priests, and that 1QS V 3 and 1QS IX 7 reflect different stages in this development.

3. Of more importance to us is the question of the consequences of expulsion. What were the tangible implications for the one concerned? Because expulsion was so closely connected to the whole structure of the sect - as will soon become evident - we have here to go through the rules of membership in their entirety.

a. In the Manual there are four sections with rules of membership, namely:

A Rules for entry I 11 - II 25
Rules for expulsion II 25 - III 12

B Rules for entry V 7-24

C Rules for entry VI 13-23
Rules for expulsion VI 24 - VII 25

D Rules for expulsion VIII 16 - IX 2

A ENTRY (I 11 - II 25)
1. The transference of knowledge, strength and property
2. Entrance into the covenant. Agenda
3. Yearly renewal of the covenant
4. Scrupulous order of precedence

EXPULSION (II 25 - III 12)
For the one who refuses to enter the covenant the following is applicable:
1. The transference of knowledge, strength and property ceases
2. The apostate can re-enter by means of:
   a) the holy spirit in the sect
   b) the humility of his soul
   c) purifications and atonements

In this section entrance into the community is of a rather simple nature. The one who enters gives over his knowledge, his strength and his property, after which he is inaugurated into the covenant. A detailed "agenda" describes how this was done. This covenant entry is closely connected with the covenant texts in the Old Testament.[66] The covenant is renewed every year. Great importance is placed on the order of rank. The sect is divided into priests, Levites and the people. The people are divided into units of a thousand, a hundred, fifty and ten men. Each one has his specific place in this order.

For expulsion it is briefly laid down that the above-mentioned transference shall cease. The rules for re-entry have a certain sting against ritualism. It is true that atonements and purifications are imposed, but these help only through the sect's holy spirit and because the one who re-enters humbles himself under God's law.

Nothing is mentioned about specific officials, or about the time period of the novitiate, or about examination of the entrant. The idea of moving higher or lower at the renewal of the covenant is rejected. No differentiation in punishments existed.

B ENTRY (V 7-24)
1. Entry into the covenant
2. The oath
3. Examination of insight and deeds
   partly before the priests, partly before the Many
4. Registration in the order of rank
5. Yearly examination, at which promotion or demotion can take place

Here is reflected largely the same structure as in A, but a few regulations have been added. An oath belongs to the entry into the covenant. The novice swears to be converted to the law of Moses and to the interpretation of the law as revealed to the priests and the Many. He furthermore promises to separate himself from all men of deceit. This regulation gives rise to a digression about these terrible people and how one must avoid them (V 11-20). Another new aspect is that the one who is to enter had to be examined. That which is described in A as a yearly renewal of the covenant is here described as a yearly census on the Old Testament pattern (Ex. 30:12ff; Num. 1:19ff), at which a member's rank can be altered.

No officials are mentioned, no time period for the novitiate, no gradation of expulsions, no difference in dealing with various groups of members.

C ENTRY (VI 13-23)
1. First examination before the Examiner
2. Entry into the covenant
3. Instruction during a non-specified period of time
4. Second examination before the Many
5. After one year: third examination before the Many
   The Purity can be touched, property is transferred
6. After one more year: fourth examination before the Many
7. Registration in the order of rank
   Property is integrated, the Drink can be touched

Even here the structure is in the main the same as in the above sections. The covenant is mentioned, as is examination before the priests and the Many and the registration of the order of rank.

But, several new stages have been added. Besides an unspecified period as a student, the novitiate totals two years. Instead of one examination, four are mentioned. Instruction in the sect's laws is prescribed. A few officials with specific duties, are named. Fellowship is instituted in stages. Here the rules of entry seem, more than before, to be marked by the hierarchical order.

In order to get a clearer picture of the procedure, we will go through it point by point.

First of all, one who sought entry was examined from the point of view of insight and deeds. The examination was carried out by the Examiner. If the applicant showed himself to be educable, he could enter into the covenant probably at a ceremony similar to the one described in section A. The title Examiner (האיש המקיד) appears only here and implies that entry into the covenant was considered as a first registration (פקד) as is the case in CD XV 8.

After this the entrant is instructed in all the laws of the sect during an unspecified period of time. Then the second examination took place, which was carried out by the Many, and where each one was questioned about his opinions. The Many could then decide if the applicant should "draw closer" (קרב) or "draw away" (רחק). If he was accepted he was still not allowed to touch the Purity (לוא יגע בטהרת הרבים) nor was he allowed to have anything to do with the Many's property (אל יתערב בהון הרבים).

First after more than a year as a novice and after a third examination, was the entrant allowed to touch the Purity. What does this mean? The Purity of the Many, טהרת (ה)רבים ,[67] the Purity of the men of holiness, טהרת אנשי הקודש ,[68] or simply the Purity, טהרה ,[69] are expressions which can be understood in two different ways depending on whether one sees them together with the rabbinic regulations about "the purities" or with Josephus' narrative about the Essenes, as a background. In the first case one refers to the fact that the rabbinic expression "purities" describes things which are ritually clean, above all food, and one therefore maintains that "the Purity of the Many" in 1QS "refers to the ritually clean articles and, particularly, to the clean food of the יחד ".[70] C. Rabin, who places the Qumran sect in the Pharisaic tradition agrees emphatically: "It is most unlikely that Purity means the ritual bath".[71] Rabin finds the solution to the problem in 1QS V 13: "He must not come to the water to touch the purity of the men of holiness". Rabin comments: "Here the 'water' and the touching of the Purity are clearly distinguished, the ritual bath is the preliminary to touching the Purity. This can only mean that the Purity is ritually pure food, the tohŏroth of the Rabbis."

Meanwhile, C. H. Hunzinger comes to exactly the opposite conclusion about the same passage.[72] "Man erlangt die טהרה also, indem man ins Wasser steigt, d.h. durch eine Waschung. --- Das heisst; wer von der טהרה ausgeschlossen ist, darf an den kultischen Waschungen nicht teilnehmen und ist somit dazu verurteilt, in Unreinheit zu leben." Hunzinger refers further to Josephus, Bellum II 137ff. There it states that the applicant for entry can, after a one-year period as novice approach the sect's way of life and "share the purer kind of holy water", καθαρωτέρων τῶν πρὸς ἁγνείαν ὑδάτων μεταλαμβάνει . Not until after still another two years as a novice could he "touch the common food", τῆς κοινῆς ἅψασθαι τροφῆς . These Greek formulations, as Hunzinger points out, can be read as translations of

יגע בטהרת הרבים (1QS VI 16f) and
יגע במשקה הרבים (1QS VI 20).

One cannot deny that on this point the similarity between the Manual and Josephus is striking. The rabbinic interpretation has this against it as well, that the technical term for "clean food" practically always appears in the plural while "the Purity", in the Qumran texts always is in the singular.

H. Huppenbauer has tried to solve the problem without drawing in parallels from outside.[72a] He proceeds from the fact that the verb טהר in 1QS does not normally describe a state, "be pure" but an action, "purify". He then means that the noun טהרה, in the same way, here has the meaning of "purifying" and not "purity". The argument is not a particularly strong one, but it does, in any case, indicate Josephus as a suitable background.

Admittedly, both interpretations can be correct to a certain extent. One is quite likely to think that the Purity indicates tangible articles or premises set apart for the purer, holier members. We can also include here articles and premises for both higher cleansings and special meals.

Even if the question cannot be answered completely, it is evident that the Purity belonged to the intermediate stage in Qumran's holy order. The outsider was not allowed to touch the Purity, nor were all the members of the covenant allowed to do it. On the other hand just the fact that one was allowed to touch the Purity did not mean that one was a full member of the community.

At the same time as the novice, after one year's novitiate, was allowed to touch the Purity, he also had to transfer his property to the Overseer.[73] The novice's credit balance was meanwhile placed on a special account and was not yet allowed to be paid out to the Many. The reason for this process can hardly be that the novice would be able to get his means back if he changed his mind. Rather, this measure was motivated by the desire to keep the sect's order pure. The economic integration had to take place in stages, keeping pace with the increase in the novice's purity, otherwise the sect's resources could be profaned. Thus, the novice had at this stage only been incorporated into the community on one point - the question of Purity.

After still one more year as a novice the entrant was examined for the fourth time, now before the Many. If he was admitted, he was enrolled among the brethren and was given his particular place on the order of rank.

We can now assume that the new member was at last allowed to touch the Drink. What does this mean? If one agrees that Josephus' description of the Essenes corresponds to that found in the Manual, and that the Purity represents "the purer kind of holy water", then the Drink can represent "the common food". If one chooses the rabbinic background and interprets the Purity as the ritually pure food, then the Drink gets its explanation from the rabbinic concept that drinks were more susceptible to impurity than solid foods. "The משקה הרבים is nothing more than the משקין of the Haburah which the Haber was not allowed to handle during his first stage of initiation."[74] Seeing we know that the communal meal filled an important place in the sect's order (1QS VI 3-8), that the chalice with wine was the central part of this meal and that the meal was connected with eschatological expectations (1QSa II 20), it seems

quite reasonable to assume that the Drink, which only a full member was allowed to touch alludes to these meals. But this is not definite.[75] In any case, the touching of the Drink implies that fellowship, which earlier was established on the question of Purity, has now been expanded on a further point.

A third point on which the new member was accepted into fellowship was the sessions for interpreting the law. Discussion and deliberation on questions of law were a part of the fundamentals of the sect. These sessions followed a strict order of procedure (1QS VI 8-13), according to which everyone had to speak when it was his turn. Apparently even novices were allowed to be present at these sessions, though they did not have the right to take an active part in the debates.[76] But now the novice was enrolled "in the order of his rank among his brethren for (participation in) law and judgement..... And his counsel shall belong to the sect, as shall also his judgement" (1QS VI 22f).

Eventually the entrant is incorporated fully into the economic community. With this, fellowship had not been established on the four fundamental points: the Purity, the Drink, the sessions for interpretation of the law, and the economy.

As a kind of reflected image of this complicated gradual process of entry, there follow now the rules for expulsion from the sect.

EXPULSION (VI 24 - VII 25)

Forms of punishment:
1. Separation from "property" (fine 10 days - 2 years)
2. Separation from the Drink
3. Separation from the sessions
4. Separation from the Purity
5. Total and definite expulsion

In this section the usual word for someone being punished is נענש.[77] What does it mean? In the OT ענש (qal) is used in the meaning of "to fine someone" and in the more general meaning "to punish"; נענש (nifal) correspondingly means "to be fined with a sum" and "to be punished".[78] There is, however, nothing to prevent the word from implying some form of penalty, even in the passages where it is said to have a more general meaning.[79] In the Damascus Document the word is used in its wider meaning.[80]

C.-H. Hunzinger has argued that נענש in 1QS does not primarily imply fines but separation from the Purity, even though this is not expressly stated.[81] The main argument is that the word in VII 19 and IX 1 is used, without a specific qualification, for a form of punishment which obviously includes even separation from the Purity. Against this one can

say that precisely 1QS VII 19f shows that נענש has another meaning. The passage reads: ".... and he shall be punished (ונענש) for two years. During the first year he is not allowed to touch the Purity of the Many, and during the second year he is not allowed to touch the Drink of the Many and must sit behind all the men of the sect." This means that during the second year the one who is punished has his punishment made lighter. He is allowed to touch the Purity now, but can still not partake in the Drink and has to sit lower than the others in rank. In other words, the sinner is punished for two years, but is cut off from the Purity for only one year. It is very likely that the situation is the same in 1QS IX 1.

Even the fact that the separation from the Purity is only expressly decreed for punishments of at least a year, is an argument for this separation not being valid in the case of shorter punishments.

Finally, the separation from the Purity and the נענש are co-ordinated into two separate punishments in 1QS VI 25. Here, in the first regulation in the catalogue of punishments, it is actually clearly stated what the word means. The regulation deals with imposters and lays down the following punishment: "And they shall separate him from the Purity of the Many for one year, and he is to be punished with a fourth of his allowance." When the word is repeated in the continuation of the catalogue of punishments, or when only the duration of the punishment is mentioned,[82] no-one needs to doubt its meaning. The word has retained its Old Testament meaning of a fine. Here it means "be imposed with a 25 % reduction in one's allowance".[83] This basic form of punishment was meted out for all offences which did not deserve definite expulsion.[84] The period of punishment was at least ten days, and at most, two years.

Thus, this punishment means that one of the components of the perfect fellowship, that of the economic unity, was reduced on behalf of the offender. The integrating of the entrant's property with that of the sect, was a part of the final phase of the novitiate. If after this he violated the sect's norms, it had to be indicated that he no longer stood in the same perfect communion as before. But, because he could not really get back his economic resources, which he had once handed over, his punishment took the form of a reduction in his maintenance.

This punishment could, however, be combined with still other measures. Judging from 1QS VII 20, separation from the Drink belonged to the punishment at least in serious cases. This means that one of the other components of the perfect fellowship was withdrawn from the offender. He could no longer take part in the meals which anticipated the Messianic time.

Furthermore, the one sentenced to two years of fines, also lost his right to take an active part in the sessions for interpreting the law (1QS VII 20). He was still allowed to be present and could thus be informed of the decisions.[85] But no-one could ask him for his point of view until both years of punishments had elapsed. This punishment meant that the

offender was barred from the third basic element of the full communion.

In the case of punishment of at least one year's duration, the one condemned, as mentioned earlier, was separated from the Purity. In this way he was barred from participation in the fourth component of the communion.

Thus, all the four forms of punishment with definite time periods, result in the deviator being partially or totally deprived of the fellowship in which he stood. He was thrust out from the centre of the sect for a longer or shorter distance and for a longer or shorter period of time. Definite expulsion lies in the extending of this punishment. He who had committed a sufficiently serious crime against the holy order of the sect was sent away and was never allowed to return (1QS VII 2, 16f, 17, 24).

D EXPULSION (VIII 16 - IX 2)
1. A member of the covenant.
Intentional defection: separation from the Purity
separationfrom information
2. A member of the "men of holy perfection"
a) Intentional or deceitful defection: definite expulsion
b) Unintentional defection: separation from the Purity
separation from the sessions for two years

The passage consists of two subsections between which there seems to be a certain contradiction.

According to the introductory words, 1QS VIII 16-19 concerns "every member of the sect, of the sect's covenant", כול איש מאנשי ברית היחד (היחד).[86] At the end of the subsection its area of application is again given: "everyone who joins himself to the sect", כול הנסף ליחד . If anyone deviates from any of the commands, intentionally, he must be punished with temporary and partial expulsion.

But the next subsection (1QS VIII 20 - IX 2) prescribes definite and total expulsion for intentional or deceitful transgressions of the law. Here too, the area of validity for this regulation is described, but now with expressions which indicate a higher degree of holy perfection. He who is condemned by this regulation belongs to "the men of holy perfection", אנשי התמים קודש.[87] The rule applies to "everyone who enters into the council of holiness", כול הבא בעצת הקודש , "those who walk on the way of perfection", ההולכים בתמים דרך .

Seeing that both subsections so carefully define the area of validity for the regulations, it is likely to seek a solution to this contradiction between them by assuming that the first subsection is intended for ordinary members and the second for the inner circle of particularly holy and perfect members. But do the formulations in the second subsection really

express a greater perfection than that which was incumbent on each member of the sect? To "walk in perfection" or "on the way of perfection" are very common formulations in 1QS.[88] They express an ideal which applied to all members. "The council of holiness", in 1QS II 25 indicates all who have entered the covenant. On the other hand, the expression "the holy men of perfection", in 1QS, appears only in VIII 20.

We find then that the second subsection probably indicates the ordinary members of the community which 1QS describes.[89] But to whom are the rules in the first subsection directed? Who are the members of the "sect's covenant" and "those who join themselves to the sect"?

As far as the first expression is concerned, we have seen that entrance into the covenant took place during the early stages of the novitiate. After a preliminary examination before the Examiner the novice was inaugurated into the covenant "to be converted to the truth and to separate himself from all evil" (1QS VI 14f). He still had a long way to go before he was incorporated into the full community. But as one having a part in the covenant, he still belonged to the outer circles of the sect.

The characteristic word in the second expression, יסף , in the sense of "attach oneself as a member", is used only in one other passage in the Manual, namely just in 1QS VI 14, right at the beginning of the detailed regulations for entry. There it describes the very first step on the novice's path.[90] He who is willing to "attach himself" is to be examined by the Examiner, incorporated into the covenant etc.

With this long novitiate the number of novices must have been considerable. The large number of examinations had quite likely resulted in a number of people being retained on the novice level. If the community 1QS describes had the characteristics of a brotherhood in which the members lived as celibates, in an economic unity of some kind, with joint religious services, meals and legal assemblies, it is quite likely that many members never attained higher than an associated membership. Perhaps they worked outside the community, perhaps they raised a family, and therefore could not become full members. From the Manual's point of view, they stood on the periphery. In this kind of situation the tension between these two subsections fills a specific function. The first subsection is directed towards the outer circle of members, the second to the full and perfect members.

A closer examination of the punishment clauses in both subsections bears out this assumption. According to the first subsection (1QS VIII 16-19) it is decreed concerning him who intentionally deviated from the commandments:

a) He must not touch the Purity of the holy men.
b) He must not be informed about the deliberations.

This implies that the person in question had earlier been allowed to touch the Purity, which took place one year before the end of the novitiate (1QS VI 16f), and that he had previously received information from the sessions. On the other hand, it does not imply that he had stood in economic unity with the perfect members, nor that he had taken an active part in the deliberations.

The second subsection, 1QS VIII 20 - IX 2, lays down as punishments for intentional or deceitful transgression of the law:

a) He must be sent away from the council of the sect and must never be allowed to return.
b) None of the men of holy perfection are allowed to enter into economic associations with him.
c) Neither must any of these counsel with him.

And for the one who has deviated unintentionally it decrees:

a) He must be separated from the Purity.
b) He must be separated from the counsels and must not take part in discussions or judicial decisions.

These punishments do not just imply that the person in question had been allowed to touch the Purity and to receive information from the deliberations. He has also been incorporated into the economic community and had a seat and a voice in the sessions, i.e. he has passed through the final phase of the novitiate (cf. 1QS VI 22f). Even 1QS IX 8 addresses "the holy men who walk in perfection" and thus refers to those who stand in full economic unity with each other and who therefore must separate themselves from non-members as well as from the novices (1QS VI 17) and those who have apostatized (1QS III 2, VIII 23).

The contradiction between 1QS VIII 16-19 and VIII 20 - IX 2 seems to be able to be solved if one assumes that the earlier subsection gives the regulations for the outer circle of the sect, those who have applied and who have entered into the covenant but who are still on the novice level, while the later subsection gives the rules of membership for the perfect members, the men of holy perfection, who have gone through the whole novitiate, been incorporated in the economic community and had a seat and a voice in the council of the sect.

A comparison of the portions of regulations for membership we have now analysed, shows that they stand in a rather singular relationship to each other. Each portion seems to build on to the one before but at the same time, to correct it and adapt it to a more differentiated situation. Section A, 1QS I 11 - III 12, only gives the structure in rough outline - transference, covenant entry, expulsion of the disobedient. B, 1QS V 7-24,

adds the oath, examination, the yearly promotion or demotion. C, 1QS VI 13 - VII 25, introduces a long and complicated novitiate and suits the punishments to the seriousness of the crime. D, finally, 1QS VIII 16 - IX 2 introduces different regulations for the various groups within the sect.

As an explanation to this strange situation I would like to suggest that the Manual was added to as the organisation of the sect evolved. In stead of making bigger changes in the old rules, they have, towards the end of the document added new rules which supplement and correct the old rules. We have already seen, that a going through of the Manual's information on judicial instances gives occasion to such an assumption.

D. Daube has shown that this method of supplementing laws was common in antiquity.[91] Because laws were often preserved in people's memories or were carefully written down on costly material, it was unpractical to fuse in new decrees into the text. It was much easier to just add them at the end of the old collection of laws. Furthermore, reverence for tradition could forbid the crossing out of that which had become out of date. Daube gives examples of such additions of new laws both in Roman justice (Lex Aquilia) and in the OT (Ex. 21; 22; Lev. 20).

The trace of such a process can still be seen in $4QS^e$,[92] where the text in 1QS VIII 16 - IX 11 is missing, that is to say, just the final section of the rules of membership in the Manual. In VIII 15, after the words: "This is the study of the Torah which he has commanded through Moses", there follows immediately, "These are the statutes for the wise man" (IX 12).[93] Both expressions can be seen as link passages to the motivations and admonitions which conclude 1QS before the (secondary?) liturgical section IX 26 - XI 22.[94] The context of $4QS^e$, though it is somewhat harsh, is therefore fully acceptable. What is more, $4QS^e$ is, according to J. T. Milik palaeographically older than 1QS.[95] The one who inserted 1QS VIII 16 - IX 11 has, however, first rounded off the old text with an admonition that one should follow Torah "according to all that is revealed time and again" (VIII 15f). Such a rounding off cannot be described as unlikely,[96] if one observes that it takes up the very theme allotted to 1QS IX 12ff, i.e. the immediate continuation of the older text in $4QS^e$. Thus, everything points towards $4QS^e$ being an interesting testimony from the sect's period of development. The long novitiate was introduced, as was the system of partial and temporary expulsions which excluded the deviator from the centre of the sect. But one had still not codified different rules for members on the novice level and for the men of the holy, perfect communion.

Finally, let me call attention to the fact that in all likelihood 1QSa and 1QSb were rolled in and sewed together with 1QS.[97] What would have happened the next time the scroll had to be rewritten? Obviously the parts sewn on would have been written in towards the end of the new scroll, perhaps after a few connecting words. In any case it was clearly no strange mode of procedure for the Qumran Sect, to supplement the old regulations with additions when necessary.

It lies outside our task to investigate the development of the Manual. It would also be a difficult undertaking as long as the fragments from cave four remain unpublished.[98] As far as we are concerned it is enough to establish the following:

a) A perusal of the Manual's regulations for membership has shown that the Qumran Sect, at least in its most developed stage, in the branch which 1QS describes, followed a complicated system of entry and expulsion by gradual stages. In the same way as entry implies that fellowship is built up step by step in the question of the Purity, the Drink, interpretation of the law, and the economy, so expulsion implies that this fellowship ceases on precisely these four points. The one expelled, to put it simply, had to walk the path of the novice, but in the opposite direction. In an extreme case he had to be totally and definitely expelled.

b) Within that branch of the Qumran sect described by 1QS, a development can be traced, from a relatively simple construction of rules for membership, with the Old Testament covenant renewal as a model, to an involved system by which entrants were gradually adapted to the sect's holiness, and by which different offences against the sect's order brought on different degrees of expulsion, and by which different rules of membership applied to the different groups of members.

b. We now go over to the regulations for membership to be found in the Damascus Document.

ENTRY (CD XV 5-11)
1. Examination before the Overseer
2. Registration by means of the covenant oath

The Damascus Document reflects a more open branch of the Qumran sect than the one the Manual describes.[99] Marriage and children are taken for granted in CD VII 6-9, XVI 10-12; XIX 3-5. In principle the priests occupy the foremost place even here, but their position is not equally dominating. The economic situation of the members seems to be more independent (XIV 13ff).

This has two consequences as far as rules of entry are concerned. First of all it was necessary to give special directions as to how a young person who had grown up in the sect could win membership. Here one referred to Ex. 30:14 where it speaks about accepting into the fellowship of those already registered a person who is twenty years old or more. The regulation in CD XV 5f reads: "And every member of the covenant for all Israel, they shall let their sons who attain 'to pass among them that are mustered' swear with an oath of the covenant."

Secondly, the rules for entry get a much simpler design than in 1QS. The following rule applies to all who are converted from the way of perdition and who want to enter the sect:

"On the day that he speaks to the Overseer of the Many, they shall muster him with the oath of the covenant which Moses concluded with Israel, namely the covenant to return to the Torah of Moses 'with all one's heart and with all one's soul', to that which is found to be done in the whole epoch of wickedness. And let no man let him know the rulings until he has stood before the Overseer, lest he turn out to be a fool when he examines him." (CD XV 7-11)

The long novitiate, the examinations before the Many, the successive building up of the fellowship, are completely missing in the Damascus Document. Here the rules of entry correspond only to the two first points in the section 1QS VI 13-23: examination before the Examiner and entrance into the covenant.[100] The registration implied that the new member was inaugurated into the sect and received his allotted place in the order of rank. "The priests first, the levites second, the children of Israel third, and the proselyte fourth. And so they shall sit and so they shall be asked about everything" (CD XIV 5-6).

The community regulated by the Damascus Document seems therefore, from the Manual's point of view, to be a community on the novice level. Its members had full fellowship in the question of Purity (CD IX 21, 23) and a lower form of communion on the question of economy (CD VI 15, XIII 11, 14-16, XIV 12ff),[101] as the novice could have according to the Manual. On the other hand, the communal interpretation of the law played no prominent role, and the communal drink is not mentioned at all.

EXPULSION

Forms of punishment:
1. Separation from the Purity
2. Fines
3. Guarding
4. Temporary expulsion
5. Definite expulsion
6. Death penalty.

Neither are the expulsion regulations as detailed in the Damascus Document as in the Manual. CD IX 1 includes the death penalty for certain serious transgressions. The implication of this rule is unclear,[102] but it does in any case testify to the fact that the death penalty was accepted with some hesitation. Even CD XII 4-6 shows that one preferred to avoid this form of penalty. According to this passage, the one who desecrates

the sabbath is not to be killed, but to be guarded (שמר) for a period of seven years, after which he can be reinstated into the community. Even those who break an oath are, according to CD XV 5, to be spared from death. However, CD IX 6, 17, X 1 and XII 3 do imply that the death penalty was used in certain instances.[103]

If the evidence was not sufficient to pass a sentence, the suspect was "separated from the Purity" (CD IX 21, 23).[104] We saw that 1QS did not prescribe separation from the Purity for punishment of less than one year's duration. But here the separation takes place before the guilt of the suspect has been proved. The association with the sect's holiness is clearer here than in 1QS. Separation from the Purity is less of a punishment than a safety measure to prevent the holy premises and articles from being bespotted by someone who might turn out to be unclean.

We glimpse remnants of a more detailed catalogue of punishments in CD XIV 20-21.[105] The only punishment which is now clear from the text is that of a fine (ענש) for six days, a punishment clause which is milder than any of the punishments enumerated in 1QS.[106]

On the other hand, in the coming age, the punishments would not be mild. When the glory of the Lord is revealed, all who have infringed the limits of the law shall be cut off (כרת) from the camp (CD XX 25f).

Finally, CD XIX 13 - XX 13 in a long and not particularly easily understood passage, deals with expulsion. The passage is divided into four sections which all begin in the same manner.[107]

a) CD XIX 13-32. "And thus shall be the case with all members of His covenant who do not hold fast to these ordinances, that they shall be visited to extinction by the hand of Belial....."

"Thus" refers back to line 11ff, where a definite historical event is told about, "the first visitation", at which "the vengeance of the covenant" fell upon all those who withstood the sect.[108] In the same way as these were judged, all will be judged who do not keep the covenant, i.e. the covenant which God made with the forefathers. Line 15 explains to whom this judgement applies. It applies to "the princes of Judah", that is to say, the leaders of the people. These have indeed entered the covenant of conversion but they have not turned aside from the way of the treacherous, they have not separated themselves from the people. They are especially accused for having allied themselves with heathen kings. Here it is clearly a question of people, who, like those affected by "the first visitation", never have been members of the sect. Line 28ff contrasts these with converted Israelites. They have separated themselves from the people, they are the rightful heirs to the covenant of their forefathers.

b) CD XIX 32 - XX 1. "And like this case is that of everyone who despises the commandments of God and who abandons them....."

This section applies to "all the men that have entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus and have acted faithlessly again and have forsaken the well of the living water". They are not to be written in the membership register as long as time shall last.

c) CD XX 1-8. "And the same is the case with every member of the congregation of the men of holy perfection who was loath to carry out the commandments of upright men....." He is to be expelled and reproved until the time he again stands with the "men of holy perfection".

We have seen that the expression "the men of holy perfection" in 1QS VIII 20 is used to describe the perfect members of the sect, in contrast to the outer circle of members on the novice level. One of the characteristics of these perfect members was the fact that they stood in full economic communion with each other, and that they had the right to take an active part in the deliberations. There is much to say for the fact that it is this group of more qualified members that we glimpse even here in CD XX 1-8. Here too "the men of holy perfection" are clearly separated from those who just belong to the covenant. Even here we see special rules given for this category. And even here it is stressed that no-one may come to economic associations with those who have fallen away from these holy ones. As in 1QS it assumes that economic communion reigns within this circle.[109]

In the Qumran texts the wording "the men of holy perfection" appears only in this section (three times) and in 1QS VIII 20. However, in CD VII 4f it speaks of "all who walk in holy perfection". Admittedly, these are only noted for their keeping the covenant. But straight after this are mentioned those who "live in camps according to the rule of the land", i.e. those who establish families. Both these groups, those who walk in holy perfection and those who live together with their families, are separated from each other.

The rules of membership for "the men of holy perfection" are ostensibly milder here than are the rules for the outer circle of members. According to section b) expulsion was definite, but according to c) it was possible to revoke it. The explanation can lie in the expression "the commands of upright men", which is unique in the Qumran texts.[110] In all likelihood this refers to laws which were not compulsory for the outer circle of members, but which had to be observed by the perfect member, the one who lived in holy perfection.

d) CD XX 8-13. "And like this is the case of everyone who despises (the Law) amongst the former ones and the latter ones (Hvidberg: who despises the former ones and the latter ones), inasmuch as they have set idols upon their heart..... They have no share in the house of Torah."

This section can be seen as a summary. All who have fallen away from the covenant shall be affected by this same judgement, because they have yielded to idols.

The whole passage CD XIX 13 - XX 13 shows how the sect considered itself to be the true heir of the covenant of their fathers. The promises were only valid for the members of the sect. At the same time, this passage shows how the thought of the sect's special holiness motivated special rules of membership for the various groups. Those who established families and who therefore did not enter into the full economic community, belonged to the outer circle of members. They were by duty bound to keep the laws of the covenant, like the novices in 1QS. It is to this outer group of covenant members that the Damascus Document is directed. But, its writers were also aware that there were members who had gone the whole way and established a more perfect community. These considered themselves as "the men of holy perfection" and were by duty bound to observe "the commands of upright men".

To sum up, the following can be said of the rules of membership in the Damascus Document:

a) The rules of entry correspond to the rules which, according to the Manual were applicable to those who wished to become novices: Examination before the Overseer (1QS: the Examiner), registration by means of making a covenant oath.

b) The hierarchical structure is obvious but not as dominating as in the Manual.

c) Of the punishments mentioned in the Manual, the separation from the Drink and the separation from the assemblies for interpreting of the law, are missing from the Damascus Document. Both these punishments imply a community to which, according to 1QS only the perfect members belonged - not members on the novice level.

d) In addition to the punishments found in the Manual, the Damascus Document mentions guarding and the death penalty, the latter, however, with reservations.

e) The difference between membership in the covenant and membership among "the men of holy perfection", was recognized.

c. The Rule of the Congregation describes an eschatological community, which, as far as its structure is concerned reminds one of the communities found described in the Manual and the Damascus Document. As in these two last-mentioned documents, the members here are also divided into groups of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens. Each group has its leader who must be thirty years old. Each man has his specified place in the order of rank, and must be respected according to his position. The priests come first in rank, next come the levites and the whole of Israel.

The children are to be instructed in the "book of Hagu" from the

time they are small, and in the decrees of the covenant for a period of ten years. At the age of twenty they are allowed to register, and are then given permission to marry. Even the women must be instructed, but in all other respects they play no part in the organisation.

d. The rules of entry for the Essenes are described by Josephus in Bellum II 137ff. According to this document entrance into the sect can be summarized in the following points:

1. Practice in the sect's mode of life
2. After one year: higher cleansings
3. After a further two years: examination
4. Registration
5. Terrible oaths
6. Food can be touched

As far as details are concerned it is difficult to harmonize these regulations with those in 1QS.[111] The biggest difference is the fact that according to 1QS, the oath comes before the novitiate, whereas according to Josephus it comes after. Even if it is not completely clear whether Josephus means that point 5. and 6. come after point 4., it is still the most likely interpretation.

However, the similarities are also considerable. Entrance into the sect takes place in stages, and with each stage the novice reaches a greater purity. The oath, examination and registration are factors which we remember from the Qumran texts. The wording "to share the purer kind of water" and "to touch the common food" has been seen above in connection with "to touch the Purity of the Many" and "to touch the Drink of the Many" (p. 55). The expression, used for a person who has gone through the novitiate, that he can "draw near", πρόσεισιν ἔγγιον to the sect's way of life can very well be associated with the term קרב in 1QS VI 16ff. That enrolment in the sect implied incorporation in an extremely strict order of rank is evident from several passages in Josephus, e.g. Bellum II 150 says:

> They are divided according to the duration of their discipline, into four grades; and so far are the junior members inferior to the seniors, that a senior if but touched by a junior, must take a bath, as after contact with an alien.

The four grades can refer to CD's division into priests, levites, laymen and proselytes, even if the position of priest and levite depended on birth and not on years of service.[112]

Josephus is less communicative on how members were expelled

from the Essene sect. But just after his report on the novitiate he tells a grotesque story of the fate of the expelled.

> Those who are convicted of serious crimes they expel from the order; and the ejected individual often comes to a most miserable end. For, being bound by their oaths and usages, he is not at liberty to partake of men's food, and so falls to eating grass and wastes away and dies of starvation. This has led them in compassion to receive many back in the last stage of exhaustion, deeming that torments which have brought them to the verge of death are a sufficient penalty for their misdoings (Bellum II 143f).

Here it must be a question of a formal total, and, in principle, definite expulsion. The paragraph shows with what ruthless consequences the Essenes observed the laws of purity; even an apostate was bound by them. But we see at the same time how other motives come into play. One could maintain that in practice the crime was atoned for by the sufferings of the one thrust out, and he could be received back with mercy.

For extremely serious offences, blaspheming God or the name of the Lawgiver, the Essenes passed the death sentence (Bellum II 145). On the other hand we hear nothing of temporary or partial expulsions, of a reduction in one's maintenance, of being shut out from sessions or from purifications or from meals.

4. Conclusion

How was expulsion carried out? In Qumran, as in other Jewish comunities, it was a duty to reprove those who deviated from the norms, in a brotherly and loving way. In this one referred to Lev. 19:17. But in Qumran, reproof was also incorporated into the formal expulsion procedure. Before one could start legal proceedings, reproving before witnesses had to take place. We found that in the Damascus Document this regulation in a special way was combined with the Old Testament laws for witnesses (Deut. 17:6; 19:15). Evidence and reproof, which related to different occasions could be accumulated, so that sentence could be passed. In this connection we find the statement that the Overseer had to note down the reproofs. Finally, it was decreed that reproof had to take place the same day as the crime was witnessed.

Information concerning which instance had to pass judgements in the question of expulsion varied in the different documents and even within the Manual itself. We found that it was likely that the powers of sentence, in the branch of the community described by the Manual, were first held in trust by the Many (a kind of hierarchically structured mass meeting),

but that it gradually became concentrated in the priesthood. The Damascus Document seems to reflect a different branch of the community, in which a collegium of ten men were to do the judging.

In going through the rules of membership we found that, according to the Manual, expulsions were elaborated in connection with the entry procedure. In the same way as fellowship was successively built up under one's novitiate on four fundamental points: the Purity, the Drink, interpretation of the law, and economy, so expulsion implied that the deviator was completely or partially deprived of fellowship on these four points. We also found that the Manual reflected a development towards a more and more differentiated procedure. The Damascus Document showed a simpler formulation of expulsion, and we found that it assumed a community which, from the Manual's point of view, was on a novice level. Josephus' information on entry into the Essene sect reminds one of the Manual's, but seems to give a more Hellenic picture of the procedure. According to Josephus, expulsion was, in principle, total and definite, but the sufferings which the one thrust out had to go through had a redeeming effect, so that in practice, it was possible to receive him back into the community.

C. Which Theological Motifs were Connected with Expulsion?

In the Old Testament terms for expulsion we found that they could be associated with either the holiness motif or the covenant motif. Both these motifs were very much alive in Qumran. Here, just as in the OT, it is almost impossible to separate the two. The covenant was considered to be a holy covenant (1QSb I 2). But, just the fact that entrance into the covenant did not always coincide with entrance into the sect (1QS VI 14f), shows that the holiness motif and the covenant motif have fixed the rules of membership in somewhat different ways. We will go through both motifs in order to find out how they have affected the regulations of membership.

1. The covenant motif we find already in the name which the Damascus Document gives to the sect, "the new covenant".[113] But, too great weight should not be placed on this designation.[114] The promise of the new covenant in Jer. 31 is never expounded more thoroughly, and it is in fact doubtful if the Damascus Document at all alludes to this prophetic text.[115]

"The new covenant" is never played off against the old. On the contrary, a large part of the Damascus Document (CD I 1 - VI 11) is

devoted to explaining how the new covenant is bound up with that of their fathers, the covenant of "the first ones". Israel had been faithless and was therefore given up to the sword. But God remembered the covenant with the forefathers and allowed "a remnant" to remain. Those who made up this remnant confessed their guilt and sought God with perfect hearts, as a result of which, God gave them the Teacher of Righteousness. For those who resisted the right way, the covenant was cancelled (II 7f). But for the remnant who clung to God's commandments, God restored His covenant with Israel. This thought is summarized in CD III 12-14:

> But with them that held fast to the commandments of God, those who remained of them, God established His covenant with Israel even to eternity by revealing to them the hidden things on which all Israel had gone astray.

The covenant in the land of Damascus was therefore considered as a continuation of God's covenant with the fathers and God's covenant with Moses. The promise of forgiveness which was tied to the covenant of the fathers was applied to those who belonged to the sect (CD IV 9f). The law which belonged to the covenant of Moses was binding also on the members of the sect (CD XV 9). That love and that wrath which applied to the fathers was now applicable to the men of the sect:

> With God's love for the forefathers who bore witness for Him, He loves them that come after them, for theirs is the covenant of the fathers. But God hates the builders of the wall, and His wrath is kindled (CD VIII 16ff).

The expression "the new covenant" seems to be chosen in order to express participation in the eschatological age.[116] To this new covenant belongs also a renewed interpretation of the Torah. The Teacher of Righteousness has investigated into the Torah (CD VI 7, VII 18), and the members of the covenant listen to his voice and do not discard the righteous statutes (CD XX 32f). That is why the new covenant has its own covenant statutes. They are enumerated in CD VI 11 - VII 4, a strange mixture of ritual and social commandments, and they are concluded with a promise of a blessing (CD VII 4-6) and a curse (CD VII 9 - VIII 1) for those who either keep or break the covenant.[117]

In the Manual the covenant theme is struck right from the start, and then sounds throughout the whole document, but with a progressively weaker tone. The covenant is described as an "eternal covenant" (1QS III 11, IV 22, V 5) and a "covenant of grace" (1QS I 8). All the passages which contain rules of membership, mention entry into the covenant. The connection with the covenant of the fathers is not stressed so strongly

as in the Damascus Document. But we catch a glimpse of the same concept of continuity between the covenants. The followers are called "those who preserve the covenant" (1QS V 2, 9). Those who enter the covenant take it on themselves to keep the law of Moses (1QS V 8, VIII 15, 22), even though it is also stressed that it is the sect's and particularly the priest's interpretation of the law that is binding (1QS V 9).

Even 1QSa regarded the sect as a covenant, of which the rules had to be taught.

However, compared with the OT a certain shift of emphasis has taken place in Qumran as regards the covenant motif. In the OT it is a question of the whole nation entering into a covenant with God, either in unison or through their representative. But the sect in Qumran was the result of a breaking away from the nation as a whole. Now it is a matter of an individual entering into the covenant of his own free will, and after careful consideration. The individual is central here, the individual is the partner in the covenant, not the nation (1QS II 20-23, CD XV 5-11, XVI 1-6).[118]

In what way then has the covenant motif affected the rules of membership in the sect?

a. The covenant motif's most obvious influence on the rules of membership can be seen in 1QS I 11 - III 12. As was mentioned earlier, 1QS I 18 - II 18 consists of an agenda for a covenant renewal feast, which is very close to the Old Testament pattern. An account of God's works in history,[119] confession of sin,[120] blessings,[121] curses,[122] and the people's "amen",[123] are in the OT well-known sections of covenant entry or covenant renewal. The individual's free choice is stressed. The rules apply to those who freely promise to keep the commandments of God (1QS I 7, 11). From this point of view, membership in the sect is more dependent on the individual's personal will than on his spiritual qualifications. Even the rules of expulsion which follow on after the agenda are to a certain extent affected by the covenant motif. The rules are directed against those who refuse to enter into the covenant - again the individual's attitude is stressed. Above all does the covenant motif lead to the pointer against ritualism which the passage contains. A purifying bath is not enough to sanctify and cleanse an apostate. Not until his deeds are become reconciled by the holy spirit of the sect, and he humbles himself before the law of God, can purifications and atonements take place. But then they also have to cleanse his body and make the sinner pleasing to God. Only in this way can the covenant with God be restored (1QS III 4ff).

b. An important part of the making of the covenant was the swearing of an oath.[124] The entrant swore solemnly to be converted to the law of Moses, as interpreted by the sect, and to separate himself from all evil

people (1QS V 8). Even CD mentions a covenant oath which the entrant had to swear (CD XV 6-8) and identifies it with the oath in the covenant which Moses allowed Israel to enter.[125] According to Josephus it was the duty of the novice to swear "terrible oaths" if he wanted to be accepted. The novice had to promise:

> "..... first that he will practice piety towards the Deity,[126] next that he will observe justice towards men: that he will wrong none whether of his own mind or under another's orders; that he will forever hate the unjust and fight the battle of the just,[127] that he will for ever keep faith with all men,[128] especially with the powers that be,[129] since no ruler obtains his office save by the will of God; that, should he himself bear rule, he will never abuse his authority nor, either in dress or by other outward marks of superiority, outshine his subjects; to be forever a lover of truth and to expose liars; to keep his hands from stealing and his soul pure from unholy gain;[130] to conceal nothing from the members of the sect and to report none of their secrets to others,[131] even though tortured to death. He swears moreover, to transmit their rules exactly as he himself received them; to obstain from robbery; and in like manner carefully to preserve the books of the sect and the names of the angels. Such are the oaths by which they secure their proselytes" (Bellum II 139-142).

Josephus' description of the Essene oaths contains several parallels with that found in the Qumran texts, but it also gives a non-Jewish, Hellenistic impression. Nothing is mentioned about the covenant, about the law of Moses or about the blessings and curses connected with the covenant. C. Schneider has pointed out that the Qumran sect shows many features which are common to other Hellenistic community formations.[132] The swearing of an oath in connection with entrance into the community was one of these features. It is possible that Josephus, in his description of the oath, has strengthened the similarities with other Hellenistic groups.

c. Also there where the theme of sin and forgiveness affects the rules of membership, the covenant motif is reflected. As a rule, one of the sections of the covenant renewal in the OT, was that in which the people acknowledged that they had broken the covenant.[133] It is expressed thus, that God is righteous and true to his covenant, but the nation has transgressed the commandments. The sufferings and misfortunes which have befallen the nation are purely the result of their having broken the covenant. It is the curses which have started to work. The only thing the people can do is to confess and plead God's mercy. Even in the prophecy of "the new covenant" the promise of forgiveness for the sinner is an integral part. "For I will forgive their wrongdoing and remember their sin no more" (Jer. 31:34).

In line with this concept, the "agenda" in the Manual lays down that those who enter the covenant must give a confession (1QS I 22ff). But perhaps it is significant that this confession seems to be formulated with the thought of the sins of their forefathers rather than their own. In the same way CD XX 27-34 connects confession of sin and forgiveness, or rather atonement, with the covenant motif. Those who kept the regulations, listened to the voice of the Teacher and confessed: "We have acted wickedly, both we and our fathers, by walking contrarywise against the ordinances of the covenant, righteousness and truth are Thy judgements upon us..... And God shall make conciliation for them and they shall witness His salvation."

Mercy for the one who turns back from his sins is in a peculiar way combined with the ordinary unreconcilable attitude towards those who stood outside: "I will not preserve anger against them that turn away from sin, and I will not show mercy towards all those who deviate from the path" (1QS X 20f).

But the thought of forgiveness is never really developed. Purifications and atonements are still necessary if an apostate is to be received back (1QS III 8ff, V 12ff). The expressions for "forgiveness", "purification", "atonement" are used parallelly and without distinction.

Thus the covenant motif has had a most obvious effect on the rules of entry into the Qumran Sect. As far as the expulsion procedure is concerned there is very little evidence to indicate that the covenant motif had any effect.

2. Also the holiness motif is central to the Qumran texts.[134] Both the sect[135] and its members,[136] are described as holy. The member's whole life had to be marked by holiness. He was to walk in the way of perfection,[137] and learn to distinguish between the clean and the unclean.[138]

For the Essenes described in the classical sources, the holiness motif also seems to have been dominant.[139] Behind the regulations about economic unity, hospitality towards the brethren of the faith, about celibacy, and behind the prohibition of slavery, lay, in all likelihood, the desire to preserve the purity of the sect. When the entrant was examined to see if he was "worthy", it seems to imply that they investigated his reliability on questions of purity.

But, on a few important points the concepts of holiness of the Qumran Sect differed from those of the OT. To begin with, in the OT the whole Israelite nation was sanctified and, as it were, elevated to a higher level of holiness. But the Qumran Sect knew itself to be the true Israel. For them, the holiness remained within the boundaries of the sect. The strange idea that the sect as a whole constituted a holy temple shows how concretely this holiness was regarded.[140] The actual sect with its members and institutions had the same marked holiness as the temple in

Jerusalem had. That is why it had to be protected and separated from all that was unclean and profane.

Secondly, we have seen that in the OT it was the holiness of God which was central and which motivated the holiness of the people. Israel must be holy, because Yahweh is holy and has sanctified Israel (e.g. Lev. 20:7f). F. Nötscher has pointed out the significant fact that a similar motivation for men's holiness is not to be found in the Qumran texts.[141] We naturally find God as holy even in Qumran, but His holiness is never put forward as a reason for, or pattern for, the holiness of the people. A person's place is no longer decided by God's dealings in history, by which Israel was chosen and sanctified, but by human factors, knowledge and deeds. When the documents do look back over history the stress is laid on the instruction in the holy way of life which God has shared with the sect through the Teacher (CD III 12ff).

Now, in what way has the holiness motif affected the rules of membership in Qumran?

a. Firstly, we have seen that the ritual norms are stressed. One was especially sensitive on such deviations as could jeopardize the holiness and purity of the sect. One example can show the effects of this.

As already mentioned, the Damascus Document gives a great deal of space to sabbath instructions, and rules that he who desecrates the sabbath must be guarded for seven years. It is a well-known fact that the sabbath rules of the Damascus Document are stricter on several points than, for example, those of the Pharisees.[142] The prohibition against helping an animal out of a well on the sabbath goes beyond that which seems to have been usual according to Matt. 12:11. But it is no mere coincidence that the sabbath commandment is made severer in Qumran. The sabbath commandment was given to Israel as a sign which was to separate that nation from all others and show that God had sanctified her. Now, when the sect claimed to constitute the "remnant" of the holy nation, it had to make the sabbath commandment stricter so that it continued to be a distinguishing sign. The thought of one's own holiness enforced strict sabbath rules and threats of expulsion against those who transgressed the regulations.

b. Furthermore we have seen that the members of the Qumran Sect had to take the greatest care about their contacts with other people. Outward relationships and outward criteria became the deciding factors for affiliation to the community. Here are a few examples:

Both in entry and expulsion from the sect the rules for economic unity played an important role. C. Rabin made us believe that this economic unity did not primarily consist of total unity of property.[143] Rather, it implies that the members could enter into economic associations with each other without the risk of drawing upon themselves any uncleanness.

Behind these rules we find the insistance on maintaining a certain measure of holiness. One's individual holiness had to be protected by means of complicated novice proceedings and casuistical rules of punishment. The same motif lies behind the rule that as soon as a member has apostatized and has been expelled all association with him on economic matters has to cease. The holiness motif is even clearer in the addition to the regulation which states that he who defies the prohibition must himself be expelled from the community (1QS VII 25). Impurity contaminates.

Three passages in the Qumran documents give a list of which persons were not allowed to belong to the sect. The lists seem primarily to be inspired by Lev. 21:17-23, where the various physical defects, which disqualified a person from priestly duties, are enumerated. By their very concreteness these lists give a strong impression of how the holiness motif allows outward criteria to be the deciding factors for a person's membership in the religious community.

1QSa II 5-9	1QM VII 3-6	$4QD^b$
1. the sick in body	1. the boy	1. the fools
2. the lame	2. the young man	2. the madmen
3. the halt	3. the woman	3. the simpletons
4. the blind	4. the halt	4. the imbeciles
5. the deaf	5. the blind	5. the blind
6. the dumb	6. the lame	6. the maimed
7. those with visible defects	7. the disabled	7. the lame
8. the senile	8. the unclean	8. the deaf
		9. the minors

Why can these not be accepted? This becomes evident from the wording which concludes each list: "For the angels of holiness are in their congregation" (1QSa II 8f), "For the angels of holiness are with their hosts" (1QM VII 6), "For the holy angels (are in the midst of it)" ($4QD^b$).[144] The sect is holy. It had communion with the heavenly world. The holy angels partook in its services, its battles, its assemblies. That is why the one who does not come up to its holiness must be expelled.

c. Our going through the entry and expulsion procedures has shown that the community's limits were differentiated. Instead of an absolute boundary we find a series of concentric circles. Entrance took place slowly and in stages and was counter-balanced by a system of more and more comprehensive expulsions.

d. Finally, the holiness motif has resulted in an almost extreme hierarchically constructed community. Each member was examined with reference to his knowledge and his deeds and then placed in his definite place in strict order of rank.

The technical term for rank in this order is תכון.[145] The verb תכן appears about ten times in the OT, especially in the poetic passages which deal with creation. It means (qal) "to estimate", (piel) "to adjust", "to mete out". God "estimates" the spirits (Prov. 16:2), the heart (Prov. 21:2; 24:12) and deeds (I Sam. 2:3). God "makes firm", "fixes" the pillars of the earth (Ps. 75:3). God "metes out" the sea (Job 28:25). Even in the Qumran texts the verb appears a few times. In 1QH I 15, a creation text passage, תכן stands parallel with כון, "be firm", "straight". In 1QS I 12, the word is used of a person "fixing" his strength according to God's perfect way.

The noun תכון is missing in the OT. On the other hand it belongs to one of the most characteristic words in 1QS. It is not without significance that it is associated with the biblical creation passages' usual roots תכן and כון. Sentences like אם תכון תבל בל תמוט "Yes, the world is established; it shall never be moved" (Ps. 93:1; 96:10; 1 Chron. 16:30), can have contributed towards giving the noun its meaning. It describes no human order drawn up for convenience. No, it is a question of an order from a higher dignity. That order which reigns in God's creation has been projected into the structure of the sect.

The noun denotes that which has been fixed, appointed, be it time periods, behaviour, rank or lot. Every member is registered on entering his תכון, that fixed rank which corresponds to his life and knowledge (1QS VI 22, VII 21, VIII 19, IX 2). This rank decides a member's place at the sessions (1QS VI 4, 8, 9) and his right to speak (1QS VI 10). Time has its defined place in the order, in the same way, and it must be observed (1QS VIII 4). This order of rank for people and time periods is completely determinative for one's mode of life. Therefore the Manual itself can give the purpose of its rules thus: "These are the regulations for the wise one, so that he shall walk in them with every living being, according to the fixed measure of every time and according to the weight of each person" (1QS IX 12, cf. 1QS IX 18).

That is why these fixed norms, תכונים, are those which separate the members from the unclean, from those that are outside the sect (1QS VIII 13). And, that is why the Manual's closing hymn sings and plays to the glory of God and "to His holy order" לתכון קודשו (1QS X 9). It was this holy order which characterized the rules of membership in Qumran. The one who violates this must be given another place within it, another rank, further away from the centre of the sect. That which could not be fitted in, had to be thrust out.

3. Conclusion

Which theological motifs were connected with expulsion? The covenant motif and the holiness motif were both active motifs in Qumran. But they have both experienced a shift in meaning in relation to the OT. The covenant motif has been individualized. It is the individual, not the whole nation, who enters into the covenant. The holiness motif has been institutionalized. Holiness is reserved for the sect and its basis is more the knowledge and mode of life of the members than God's holiness and sanctification.

Of the two motifs, the covenant motif has above all influenced the ceremony for entrance into the sect. The holiness motif has dominated the regulations for a member's position within the sect and for his expulsion from the community.

Only on a few points has the covenant motif been able to break through the dominance of the holiness motif on the question of expulsion. When 1QS III 8 gives an upright and humble spirit as a condition for reentrance, when CD XX 4 speaks of the duty to reprove even the one who is expelled, or when Josephus (Bellum II 143f) tells how compassion drove the Essenes into receiving back the one they had thrust out, and who would otherwise have perished because of the laws of purity - then we see glimpses of the Old Testament covenant motif.

But the relationship between these two motifs is not constant within the sect. If the supposition mentioned above (p. 61f) is correct, that the Manual grew parallel with the development of the sect, then one can also find in the text an interesting theological development. There is namely no doubt about the fact that the rules of membership in the earlier part of the Manual stress the covenant motifs more, while in the rules of membership in the latter part all the weight is laid on the holiness motif. The description of the covenant entry, the confession of sin, the curses and the blessings are found in the first of the four sections of rules of membership. An anti-ritual tendency is to be found only in the first section (1QS III 4ff) and in a milder form in the second (1QS V 13). In the third and fourth sections the covenant motif is practically mentioned only by name. According to section three entrance takes place by gradual stages into the holy community. In the same section the rules for expulsion are characterized by the thought of the sect's holiness. In the fourth section, and not until then, are the perfect members called "the men of holy perfection", and the rules for expulsion are differentiated with reference to the different levels of holiness.

If the picture we have got of how the Manual came into being is correct, then the development within the sect is one which goes towards greater emphasis of the holiness motif. In the next chapter we meet a community in which the holiness motif instead received less and less significance.

Notes to Chapter II

1) For literature up to 1965, see C. Burchard, Bibliographie I-II. Literature thereafter is given in Revue de Qumran.
2) Other opinions are held by C. Rabin, G. R. Driver, C. Roth et alii. For these, see e.g. F. M. Cross, Library, 72-76, note 33. For further discussion about problems of dating, see H. Bardtke, Handschriftenfunde II, 184-198.
3) This is a modified truth, as the buildings in Qumran were destroyed 31 B.C. by an earthquake and a fire and stood more or less waste, until they were rebuilt at the beginning of the Christian Era.
4) For a symbolic interpretation, see e.g. F. M. Cross, Library, 81ff, note 46.
5) For the texts from Philo, Jerome and Michael the Syriac about the Therapeutae, see A. Adam, Berichte, 7-22, 54f, 60f.
6) Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, II:2. More editions and translations are listed in C. Burchard, Bibliographie II, 337f.
7) RB 67 (1960), 410-416. C.-H. Hunzinger, Arbeit, mentions 11 mss.
8) Discoveries III, 180f.
9) Discoveries III, 181ff.
10) Documents of Jewish Sectaries I. Fragments of a Zadokite Work.
11) Discoveries III, 181, 226; J. T. Milik, Ten years, 58, 103, 114, 117, 124f, 151f.
12) Discoveries III, 181.
13) Discoveries III, 128ff.
14) Discoveries III, 130f.
15) Discoveries I, 108ff.
16) Cf. L. Rost, Anhänge, 667-672.
17) J. Strugnell, BA 19 (1956), 94; H. Bardtke, Handschriftenfunde II, 154.
18) The antique texts on the Essenes are gathered in A. Adam, Berichte.
19) For the animatedly discussed date problems, see e.g. P. Wernberg-Møller, Manual, 1-21; F. M. Cross, Library, 119-122.
20) D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, date 1QSa as belonging to an older period of the community's development in relation to 1QS.
20a) This is true of the Josephus text here under consideration (Bellum II 119-161). In two minor texts on the Essenes (Bellum I 78-80; II 111-113) Josephus relies on Nicolaos of Damascus, the historian of Herod the Great. This is seen among other things by the fact that in the long text Josephus calls the Essenes ἐσσῆνοι, while he in the short texts calls them ἔσσαῖοι. O. Michel - O. Bauernfeind, Josephus Bellum I-III, p. XXVIf.
21) P. Guilbert, Plan, makes a barely successful effort to demonstrate a systematic arrangement in the Manual. On the Damascus Document, see K. G. Kuhn, Qumranforschung, 652f.

22) For detail observations, see M. Weise, Kultzeiten, 103ff.
23) 1QS: לעבור הבא בברית הזות. P. Wernberg-Møller, Manual, 40, 54 note 29 alters to לעבוד referring to Deut. 29:17. But the word is taken from Deut. 29:11.
24) Cf. Ezek. 14:3.
25) Cf. Deut. 29:18.
26) Or possibly "clean worship". P. Wernberg-Møller, Manual, 77 note 17.
27) Quotations from the Damascus Document are as a rule given according to C. Rabin's translation.
28) Allusion to Deut. 29:28. The "hidden" was interpreted as the secret rules of the community, and the "revealed" as the Torah of Moses.
29) On the conflict of these rules, see p. 59-61.
30) Cf. Ex. 22:28; Lev. 24:15f. The "legislator" probably refers to Moses. But some propose the Teacher of Righteousness. See O. Michel - O. Bauernfeind, Josephus Bellum I-III, 437 note 70.
31) See latest H. Hübner, Zölibat, where the arguments for and against the hypothesis of celibacy in Qumran are summarized. However, Hübner's own exposition of 4QpPs 37, according to which the raising of children is presupposed in the Order at Qumran, is not convincing.
32) Either in the way that celibacy is presupposed (H. Braun, Radikalismus I, 40 note 2), or in the way that marriage is presupposed. For this, see H. Hübner, Zölibat, 154f. For the alleged allusions to marriage in the Manual (1QS I 1 and IV 7), see H. Braun, Radikalismus I, 40 note 1 a, b.
33) 4Q 159 presupposes marriage, but whether for the whole community or only for a part of it is not clear.
34) Pliny, Naturalis Historia V 17 (A. Adam, Berichte, 38).
Philo, Defensio 11:14 (A. Adam, Berichte, 7).
Josephus, Bellum II 120f (A. Adam, Berichte, 26f).
35) Bellum II, 160f.
36) A. Isaksson, Ministry, 45-57, tries to combine the texts by assuming that marriage was commended up to the age of 25, when the men were mustered for the holy war and had to live in celibacy. This interesting hypothesis rests on the doubtful presupposition that 1QM reports actual, social conditions.
37) H. Braun, Radikalismus I, 40 note 3.
38) The Damascus Document seems to display stricter sexual morals than was usual. In CD IV 20f the otherwise accepted polygamy is forbidden with reference to Gen. 1:27 (cf. Mark 10:2-9). CD V 7-11 is against marriage to a niece, which goes beyond the OT. Cf. H. Braun, Radikalismus I, 131ff.
39) According to J. M. Allegro, Discoveries V, 6ff, 4Q 159 mentions lifetime expulsion (fragm. 2-4, line 10). This is, as J. Strugnell, Notes, 176ff, points out, quite wrong. The rule prescribes, following Deut. 22:19, that a man who is lying about his wife's virginity must not divorce her.
40) Cf. P. Wernberg-Møller, Manual, 112f note 1.
41) CD XV 1-5 is possibly a parallel. The text forbids the naming of God, Yahweh and the Torah with oaths, for if you do so and then break the oath, you profane the Name. Penalty: fine.
42) H. Braun, Radikalismus I, 116ff. H. Bietenhardt, Sabbatvorschriften.
43) Quotations from Josephus are as a rule given according to H. S. J. Thackeray's translation (Loeb).
44) For Hippolyte and his relations to Josephus, see M. Black, Scrolls, 187ff.
45) C. Rabin: "stranger". Cf. CD XIV 4, 6.
46) CD XIV 20ff seems to contain remnants of a similar list. After CD XIV in a now missing penal code, some fragments from cave four could possibly be placed. Cf. J. T. Milik, Ten Years, 151f.
47) See Chapter IV note 319.
48) Two examples from outside the Qumran texts. Eccles. 19:13f. "Reprove a friend, maybe he did it not, and if he did anything, (reprove him) that he may not continue. Reprove your neighbour, maybe he said it not, and if he said it, (reprove him) that he may not do it again."
Test. Gad. 6:3ff. "And if a man sin against thee, cast forth the poison of hate and speak peaceably to him, and in thy soul hold not guile; and if he confess and repent, forgive him. --- And if he be shameless and persist in his wrongdoing, even so forgive him from the heart, and leave to God the avenging." R. H. Charles, Apocrypha II, 341f.
49) לאיש . Cf. 1QS VII 10, VIII 11, X 17f, CD XII 6, XIV 15. The translation of B. Reicke, "mot var enskild" ("to each individual") can give the wrong impression that the text commends reproving in private. Cf. B. Reicke, Handskrifterna I-II, 75 note 70.
50) The latter half of the quotation reconstructed with the aid of $4QS^d$. J. T. Milik, RB 67 (1960), 412.
51) See F. F. Hvidberg, Menigheden, 134f.
52) C. Rabin: "though they testify about one occasion".
53) In bMakk 6b it is only a question of uniting of witnesses to one and the same criminal act. Cf. C. Rabin, Documents, 48 note 20:1. Nor is pDem II 1, 22c a parallel, since that text does not refer to a matter of discipline. Cf. C. Rabin, Studies, 32, 111.
54) Cf. Eph. 4:26; Hebr. 3:13.
55) In $4QD^e$ and 5Q 12 the context is different. Between CD IX 6 and 7 these fragments give another text which, however, seems to deal with the danger of "hatred" against a brother. Discoveries III, 181.
56) כיא ביום. יוכיחנו
ביום is puzzling. P. Wernberg-Møller reads ביום אור = ביומור = (cf. Amos 8:9). B. Reicke reads ביומה and places ה

with the next word. But why מ ? Is it not conceivable that a plain error has been incompletely corrected?

57) J. T. Milik, RB 67 (1960), 413.

58) The problem whether the three priests are included in the twelve is not a significant one. The corresponding group in CD X 4 consisted of ten men, of which four were priests. 4Q 159 mentions a collegium of twelve men, of which two were priests. No symbolic meaning was attached to the number. According to A. Kapelrud, Behörden, 264, a fragment from cave four mentions a collegium of fifteen members. I guess this is a case of growing tradition. Kapelrud refers to A. Dupont-Sommer, who refers to J. T. Milik, who only says that the fragment gives a passage "that corresponds, with some abbreviation, to a section of the Rule of the Community (VIII 1-10, the Council of fifteen men)". Cf. J. T. Milik, Ten Years, 96.

59) P. Wernberg-Møller, Manual, 122 note 1: "VIII 1 is the only passage in 1QS, in which a special body of members is mentioned".

60) Whether the expression "the council of the community" here and in 1QS VII 22, VIII 5, 22 refers to the whole order or to a specific group within the community, is debatable. As the expression in 1QS III 2, V 7, VI 3, 10, 14, 16, VII 2, 24, VIII 11 and XI 8 seems to intend all who have complete membership in the order, this is probably the meaning also in the remaining passages.

61) VIII 3: "to pay off the sin by doing justice".
VIII 6f: "to punish the impious".
VIII 10: "to deliver judgement over wickedness".

62) "The wise" (1QS III 13, IX 12, 21, CD XII 21, XIII 22) probably is the ordinary member. P. Wernberg-Møller, Manual, 66 note 39.

63) C.-H. Hunzinger, Beobachtungen, 241, ascribes judicial power to the Overseer of the Damascus Document. His main argument is that the expression "He shall loosen all fetters that tie them", CD XIII 10, intends abolition of disciplinary punishments. But such expressions can be used in different connections.

64) B. Reicke, Verfassung.

65) Cf. 1QS VI 11f; P. Wernberg-Møller, Manual, 27f, 89f.

66) K. Baltzer, Bundesformular, 58f.

67) 1QS VI 16, 25, VII 3, 16, 19:

68) 1QS V 13, VIII 17.

69) 1QS IV 5, VI 22, VII 25, VIII 24, CD IX 21, 23,

70) S. Lieberman, Discipline, 203.

71) C. Rabin, Studies, 7.

72) C.-H. Hunzinger, Beobachtungen, 233f.

72a) H. Huppenbauer, ThZ 13 (1957), 350f.

73) The word here used, ערב (1QS VI 17, 22, VII 24, VIII 23, IX 8), does not express that all property was in common. It signifies entering into such economic relations that are acceptable from the purity point of view. Cf. C. Rabin, Studies, 27ff. However, regarding such passages as 1QS I 12f, III 2, V 2, it seems plausible to see in 1QS VI 13-23 a gradual transference of property to the community.

74) S. Lieberman, Discipline, 203. Cf. C. Rabin, Studies, 9.

75) It could be tempting to interpret the Drink symbolicly as referring to the community's interpretation of the law. The word is used in this sense in 1QH IV 11 and VIII 4. In 1QS the word is found in VI 20 and VII 20, where it is said that active participation in the legal sessions was reserved for members who were just and had gone through the novitiate. Also 1QS III 3, where $4QS^{c}$ has confirmed the reading בעין תמימים could be advanced in support of this. However, such a poetic metaphor hardly fits the style of these rules. And the verb "touch" intimates that the drink is something concrete.

76) In any case 1QS VII 20 prescribes this for a person who had completed the first of two years of expulsion.

77) 1QS VI 25, 27, VII 2-6, 8, 11-16, 18f, IX 1.

78) W. Gesenius, Handwörterbuch, 607.

79) Prov. 17:26; 21:11; 22:3; 27:12. Cf. L. Koehler, Lexicon, 722.

80) CD III 4, XIV 2, XVI 17. In CD XIV 21 a fine can be intended.

81) C.-H. Hunzinger, Beobachtungen. 233ff.

82) 1QS VII 9f.

83) Cf. 4Q 159 4:9.

84) The only exception is 1QS VII 6f. The one who embezzles the property of the community shall repay it. The writer was surprised at this unlogical exception and left space in the text for complementary rules. For another suggestion, cf. W. H. Brownlee, Manual, 29 note 15.

85) In 1QS VIII 18 the convicted is deprived the right to information.

86) $4QS^{d}$ omits the first היחד .

87) Grammatically impossible. To judge from the word order תמים was understood as a noun, "perfection". But in stat. constr. to קודש it should not have def. art. P. Wernberg-Møller et alii alter it to אנשי תמים הקודש. Cf. CD XX 2, 5, 7.

88) I 8, II 2, III 9, IV 22, VIII 10, 18, 21, IX 2, 5, 6, 8, 9, 19.

89) Other hypotheses have been advanced to explain the tension between the two subsections. C.-H. Hunzinger, Beobachtungen, 243: 1QS VIII 20ff is "ein Element einer älteren Tradition". C. Rabin, Documents, note to CD X 3, and P. Wernberg-Møller, Manual, 130 note 51: 1QS VIII 17 refers to the oral Torah, VIII 22 to the written.

90) Cf. CD XIII 11.

91) D. Daube, Law, 74-101.

92) J. T. Milik, RB 67 (1960), 413.

93) See note 62.

94) Missing in $4QS^{e}$.

95) J. T. Milik, Ten Years, 123.

96) Cf. C.-H. Hunzinger, Beobachtungen, 244.

97) Discoveries I, 107ff.
98) P. Guilbert, Plan, consider 1QS as a homogenous opus. A.-M. Denis, Évolution, maintains that 1QS VIII 16 - IX 1 is an addition that is older than its context. J. Murphy-O'Connor, Genèse, finds that 1QS VIII 16 - IX 2 belongs to the second oldest stratum in 1QS.
99) See L. Rost, Struktur, 395f.
100) According to J. T. Milik, Ten Years, 103, 4QD^{b} intimates that the most essential moments in the entrance ceremony were vows, blessings and curses. That Milik is referring to 4QD^{b} is clear from the index, p. 158.
101) The Damascus Document
forbids any connection with property that is polluted by vow or devoting (VI 15),
forbids commerce with the gentiles as far as it concerns clean animals, birds, cereals and wine (XII 8-11),
prescribes that a new member shall be examined regarding his property (XIII 11),
forbids exchange and prescribes written permission by the Overseer as a condition for entering into a partnership (XIII 14-16),
prescribes that two days wages each month shall be levied as tax for the social care of the community (XIV 12ff).
The members in this branch of the Qumran community obviously had a private income. They had freedom to be employed by gentiles, to buy in cash from them and to sell handicrafts for cash (XIII 14f).
XX 7 makes an exception. There every economic agreement with apostates is forbidden. But this rule refers to "the men of holy perfection", see p. 66.
The Manual of Discipline precribes
that the property of the member shall be brought to the community (I 12f, III 2),
that the property of the novice shall be given to the Overseer (VI 19),
that the property of the member shall be "integrated" with the property of the community (VI 22),
Economic communion is prescribed (V 2),
common decisions shall be made in economic matters (V 3).
The sons of Aaron shall have control over property (IX 7).
Communion with deviators is not allowed in work and economy (V 14, 16, 20, VII 25, VIII 23, IX 8).
The order has its own property (VII 6), from which the members get their living (VI 25).
Property and work you shall leave to the men of perdition as a slave to his ruler (IX 22), that is: only if you are forced.
102) Either the rule prescribes that persons who are left to destruction shall be delivered to the gentiles for execution (C. Rabin), or the rule is directed against persons who, combining Lev. 20:23 and 27:28 took the law in their own hands and executed apostates (I. Rabinowitz, Meaning).
103) C. Rabin thinks that CD XI 23 prescribes the death penalty for polluting the worship. But the passage is defective.
104) See p. 49.
105) J. T. Milik, Ten Years, 151f.
106) C. Rabin finds a penalty of imprisonment in CD XV 14. The text is very defective.
107) L. Rost, ThLZ 78 (1953) 143-148, sees CD XIX 26 - XX 15 as a unit which is arranged in four sections. "Viermal erklärt der Text כן המשפט 19, 28f.; 19, 32; 19, 33; 20, 8 und grenzt so vier Gruppen ab." However, the situation is as follows:
CD XIX 13 --- וכן משפט לכל
CD XIX 28 --- כן משפט לשבי
CD XIX 32 --- וכמשפט הזה לכל
CD XIX 33 --- (כן) כל האנשים
CD XX 1 --- וכן המשפט לכל
CD XX 8 --- וכמשפט הזה לכל
Of these formulas XIX 28 and XIX 33 clearly deviate from the pattern (ו and כל or משפט are missing) and cannot be used for arranging the text. On the other hand Rost just bypasses XIX 13 and XX 1.
108) F. F. Hvidberg, Menigheden, 187, thinks of "the martial events at the end of which the members of the covenant emigrated".
109) F. F. Hvidberg, Menigheden, 192: It hardly denotes the whole community, but rather a higher group within it.
110) The expression from Ps. 19:9; cf. 1QS III 1.
111) C. Rabin, Studies. 9ff.
112) Cf. Philo, Quod omnis, 81.
113) CD VI 19, VIII 21, XIX 33, XX 12. Cf. 1QpHab II 3. R. F. Collins, Berîth-Notion, 577ff, also points to 1Q 34 ^{bis} III 2, 5-7; 1QSb III 26; V 20.
114) A. Jaubert, Notion, 222: "Deux phases, non deux alliances".
115) R. F. Collins, Berîth-Notion, 572ff.
116) R. F. Collins, Berîth-Notion, 575ff.
117) K. Baltzer, Bundesformular, 105-127, finds the Old Testament form "covenant formula" both in the Manual and in the Damascus Document. But the regular reference to God's acts in history has been replaced by a dogmatic exposition (1QS III 15 - IV 1, CD I 1 - VI 11).
118) A. Kapelrud, Bund, 142, 147.
119) 1QS I 18-22. Cf. Deut. 29:1-7; Josh. 24:2-13; Neh. 9:7-31.
120) 1QS I 23 - II 1. Cf. Neh. 9:33-35; Ex. 34:9; Ezra 10:2.
121) 1QS II 1-4. Cf. Deut. 28:1-14.
122) 1QS II 4-18. Cf. Deut. 28:16-68; 29:18-27.

123) 1QS I 20, II 10, 18. Cf. Deut. 27:15ff.
124) Cf. 2 Chron. 15:14f; Neh. 10:30; Ezra 10:5; 1QH XIV 17.
125) Cf. Neh. 10:29f.
126) 1QS IV 2.
127) Cf. 1QS I 3, 9f. Hippolyte Ref. 23:3: "that he will neither harm anybody, nor hate an enemy, but pray for them". A Christian insertion?
128) אמת ? 1QS I 5, II 24.
129) 1QS VI 2, 26.
130) CD VI 15, VIII 4f.
131) 1QS VIII 11f? CD XV 10f.
132) C. Schneider, Probleme, 305ff.
133) Ex. 34:9; Deut. 9:18ff; Neh. 9:16ff; Ezra 9:6ff; Dan. 9:4ff. K. Baltzer, Bundesformular, 48ff.
134) F. Nötscher, Heiligkeit, 165.
135) 1QS II 25, V 6, 20, VIII 5f, 8, 11, 21, IX 2, 6, XI 8, CD XX 25, 1QSa I 9, 13, II 9.
136) 1QS V 13, 18, VIII 17, 20, 23, IX 8, CD VII 5, XX 2, 5, 7.
137) See note 88.
138) CD VI 17f, XII 19f.
139) G.W. Buchanan, Role.
140) B. Gärtner, Temple, 16-46.
141) F. Nötscher, Heiligkeit, 320f.
142) See note 42.
143) C. Rabin, Studies, 22ff.
144) J.T. Milik, Ten Years, 114. Cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, Feature, 41ff.
145) M.Z. Kaddari, TKN.

III. Expulsion from the Religious Community within Rabbinic Judaism

The Jewish society during the first 70 years of the Christian Era embraced a great variety of communities. Groups, parties, sects lived side by side with varying degrees of tension in their relationships with each other. The Qumran Sect, which we dealt with in the previous chapter, belonged to the more exclusive groups. It was never able to permiate the Jewish people - and it did not try to do so either.

Instead it was the Pharisaic community which set the tone. Numerically it was not impressive, but it seems to have had an authoritative position even before the Jewish war, 66-72. [1] And its significance became enormous, because it was its representatives who reorganized Judaism after the war.

Thus there was a kind of continuity between the Pharisaic community and the Jewish community after about the year 70. The latter inherited from the former and carried on its traditions. That is why the rabbinic literature is the primary source for knowledge of the Pharisaic community. [2]

This authoritative main line of Judaism we will call, for the sake of simplicity, "Rabbinic Judaism", even though the name fits the Judaism as organized by the rabbis after the year 70 much better than that of the Pharisees. The historic continuity and the character of the sources make this designation justifiable. It is expulsion from the religious community in this main stream of Judaism, the "Rabbinic Judaism", which we shall investigate. We will limit ourselves to New Testament times - roughly the first 130 years of the Christian Era.

First a few introductory lines about this religious community. The backbone of the Pharisaic community was made up of a number of organized fellowships, חבורות. The members of these fellowships particularly guarded the rules for tithing and ritual purity. They reacted against the fact that such rules were treated nonchalantly by those who stood outside the Pharisaic community. With a contemptuous term, which had previously been used for the pagan population in Palestine, they now called them עם הארץ, "the people of the land". The word implies that the Pharisees considered themselves as the true Israel. [3] Certain traditions testify of an attitude of condescension and scorn which is on a level with the attitude we found in Qumran. [4]

Entrance into the fellowship was drawn up in about the same way as entry into the Qumran Sect, and there is no reason for making a new

construction here. The traditional sources are somewhat meagre and furthermore somewhat different in the Mishnah (Dem II 2f) and the Tosephta (Tos Dem II 2, 11f).[5] But, in any case, it is clear that entrance consisted of two stages. In the preparatory stage the entrant took it upon himself to observe more stringent regulations about tithing. As a result of this he was considered to be "reliable", נאמן, which meant that one could now without any risk have dealings with him or eat with him.[6] One could be sure that even in doubtful situations he had paid his tithe on what he sold or offered one to eat. After a time as "reliable" the entrant was taken up as an "associate", חבר. With this he took it upon himself the observance of rigid purity rules in addition to the rules of tithing. The new obligations were to the effect that all food should be eaten in a state of ritual purity. This stage seems to have included several different grades, and seems to have lasted for a specific length of time, more than a year according to Shammai, a few months according to Hillel.[7] During this time the member undertook to observe more and more regulations in order to prevent contamination, and was thus drawn further and further into the community.

Even if not all or even most of the Pharisees were scribes, these naturally constituted the leaders of the community.[8] It was they who drew up the guidelines for how to act in given situations. Only the scribes could, by means of their discussions and studies, decide which contacts were safe and which should be considered as leading to contamination. Only they could decide on what commodities one had to pay tithe. As was the case in Qumran we can assume that when the Pharisaic fellowships met together much time was given to instruction and discussion of such theological questions.[9]

After the catastrophe of year 70 there was no other Jewish group, except the Pharisees, who could claim the leadership. The Christians already had other and deeper loyalties which broke open the limits of Judaism. The Qumran Sect was a far too isolated group, probably hard hit by the war. The priesthood had lost its temple. The Sadducees and the Zealots had, both in their own way, become too politically tied. On the other hand, the Pharisees had skilfully kept their balance through the political conflict. At the same time as they kept the confidence of the people, they also won over that of the Romans. And, their religious program was not tied to the temple or Jerusalem. Through Johanan b. Zakkai and his disciples, the Pharisaic community - more in Hillel's version - became the foundation for the new Jewish community.[10]

But even if there is such a connection between these two communities, that one can speak of a continuity between them, the events of year 70 and the period immediately thereafter, brought about an important transformation of the community. Before: a community among many others in the nation. Now: a national community. Before: a system of norms adapted to the elite. Now: a system of norms which gradually

had to be adapted to the whole nation. Before: sanctions which only could affect those who joined of a free will. Now: sanctions which could affect every Jew. In the following we shall see several examples of how this transformation of the community influenced both theory and practice as far as expulsion was concerned.

In the new situation the purpose of the organized Pharisaic fellowships appeared more and more doubtful. These small groups which during the time of the temple considered themselves as struggling minorities suddenly found that power and responsibility were laid in the hands of the Pharisaic scholars. What was there now to struggle for? The organisation continued to live its life, as organisations usually do. But after the Hadrianic war a revision was obviously necessary. To the traditions in the Mishnah and Tosephta about entrance into the fellowship there are attached names of scribes who were active round about the year 150 A.D.: R. Meir, R. Judah (b. Ilai), R. Simeon (b. Yohai), R. Joshua (b. Karha) etc. It is evident that the rules of membership were then looked over and that the conditions of membership were slackened.[11]

That the Pharisaic fellowships gradually disappeared is reflected in the use of the terms. From about the third century חבר becomes a title with about the same meaning as תלמיד "disciple".[12] חבורה comes to mean "teaching college".[13] עם הארץ which in the Pharisaic usage meant the Jew who stood outside the Pharisaic community now comes to mean "an unlearned person", "one who does not know the law".[14] And the actual word פרוש disappears during the second century A.D. as signifying party.[15] The Aramaic noun פרישות no longer has anything to do with Pharisaism. It only signifies piety and abstinence.[16] Pharisaism as a Jewish party has definitely left the stage.

A. Which Deviations Led to Expulsion?

1. Expulsion from the Pharisaic Community

Only two traditions speak expressly of expulsion from the Pharisaic community. I will reproduce them here as they are found in the Tosephta.

> Tos Dem II 9 (48):
> And all of these who retracted, they must never be received back. [These are] the words of R. Meir. R. Judah says: If they retracted publicly they may be received back, if in secret they must not be received. R. Simeon and R. Joshua say: They may always be received, as it is said: Turn, O backsliding children (Jer. 3:14).

This tradition is also reproduced in bBekh 31a in a longer version with the addition that the halakah, the accepted, doctrinal teaching, follows Simeon and Joshua (b.Karha, both around 150 A.D.). Strictly speaking the tradition does not deal with expulsion but with the possibilities of return for the one who has backslidden. But, in any case, it does show that rules for membership were discussed round 150 A.D., and that it was possible, according to the stricter, older concepts, to declare a person as being definitely shut out from the community. No concrete reason for expulsion is given.

> Tos Dem III 4 (49):
> At first they used to say: if an associate becomes a tax-collector, he is deprived of his status as associate.[17] Later they altered this and said: As long as he is a tax-collector, he is not considered reliable; once he has withdrawn from being a tax-collector, he is reliable.

This tradition is also reproduced, with a few small changes, in bBekh 31a and pDem II 3, 23a (10).[18] The first concept mentioned in the text is dated by Billerbeck as being from the first century.[19] If this is correct, being a tax-collector was at that time considered to be an offence worth of definite expulsion from the community.[20] Why? One explanation is that the tax-collector, in his work, had to visit people in their homes and by doing so he brought contamination on himself.[21] Another explanation could be that, in principle, the tax-collector was suspected of dishonesty.[22] The above tradition gives no more information. Later, one, this hard judgement on the tax-collector is somewhat softened. If he gave up his shady profession, he was allowed to return. According to pDem II 3, 23a he could again be considered as an associate. But according to the Tosephta he was only counted as reliable, and thus he had to begin again as novice.[23] When did the rule become milder? Seeing that the term נאמן, which is used here, did not replace the term מעשר until the second century,[24] it is likely that the change took place in connection with the discussions around 150 A.D. concerning membership in the remaining Pharisaic groups.

2. Birkat ha-minim

After the catastrophe of A.D.70 the Pharisees faced the problem of creating an integrated Jewish community. A whole series of different measures were taken with this end in view.[25] The teachings of the Sadducees were declared to be heretical. The text and range of the canon was determined, in polemics with the Jewish Christians, among others etc. A heavenly voice declared the halakah as generally following the

Hillelites and not the Shammaites. The principles for exegesis of the Scriptures were defined.

To the measures for preserving the unity of this new, normative Judaism belonged the amplifying of the twelfth prayer of the so-called Eighteen Benedictions, שמנה עשרה.[26] Euphemistically this added point in the prayer was called "birkat ha-minim" (ברכת המינים), "the blessing over the heretics". In the Palestinian form, discovered by S. Schechter, the twelfth prayer sounds as follows:

> For apostates let there be no hope.
> The dominion of arrogance do thou speedily root out in our days.
> And let Christians (נוצרים) and the sectarians (מינים) perish in a moment.
> Let them be blotted out of the book of the living,
> And let them not be written with the righteous.[27]

Now, a tradition in bBer 28b mentions that Samuel the Small on the encouragement of Rabban Gamaliel II composed a birkat ha-minim and added it to the rest of the Eighteen Benedictions. At the same time it is mentioned that if someone stumbles while reading the other prayers he can still continue reading, but if he stumbles while reading the birkat ha-minim he must leave his place as reader because he is suspected of being min. Even in Justin there is information that Jews, after the fall of the temple, cursed the Christians in the synagogues.[28] So, at least the last three points in the twelfth prayer quoted above could correspond to an addition from about 90 A.D.[29]

But who were minim?[30] Some maintain that they were Jewish gnostics. These refer to the fact that if it were the Christians who were aimed at, the wording in the birkat ha-minim is somewhat tautological. Others say that minim also denotes Jews who have joined themselves to Christianity. The word נוצרים could then be a later addition, when one no longer knew what minim meant.[31] Probably the word minim here simply implies people who call themselves Jews but who deviate from the Jewish orthodoxy. During this earlier period no sharp distinction was made between the many different forms of deviations from the Judaism which the rabbis represented. That which was important to those who added the birkat ha-minim was not to distinguish between the different forms of deviation. The unity had to be protected from every sectarian group.[32]

The effect of this point in the prayer was very ingenious. It was from now on impossible for someone who knew himself to be a Christian or who in any other way deviated from the normative Judaism, to read the Eighteen Benedictions aloud or to respond with an "amen" when they were read up. At this same time the duty of reading the Eighteen Benedictions in private every day was inculcated. R. Gamaliel II wanted this

reading to be obligatory both morning and evening but did not get his will through and was therefore forced to leave his post as president of the academy.[33] However, the prayer had to be read every morning, and just this must have resulted in the deviator leaving the Jewish community. Birkat ha-minim therefore acted as a total, definite expulsion. The level of formality was low. Without any formal decisions, without any trials and expulsion sentences, the deviator was in this way thrust out of the community. Judaism was no longer pluralistic.

3. The Ban

P. Billerbeck, in his fundamental excursus on the synagogue ban has given examples of a series of different disciplinary measures against those who deviated from the Jewish community.[34] The mildest of these measures was נזיפה, a "reprimand", or "warning" which a teacher could use against a pupil, and which entailed that the one who was warned had to avoid the company of the one who gave him the warning. This reprimand normally lasted for seven days in Palestine and one day in Babylonia and ceased automatically at the end of this period.

The "little ban" נדוי (or in Babylonia שמתא), was severer, and lasted 30 days. The "great ban" חרם, was the severest ban form and was used when the little ban had been pronounced twice without the one who was banned showing any change for the better.

C.-H. Hunzinger, in his dissertation of 1954, made the necessary chronological stratification of Billerbeck's material.[35] Twelve years later, J. E. Mignard carried out the same work, obviously independently of Hunzinger.[36] Below I build on Hunzinger's excellent presentation, even if I do not follow his arrangement, and even if I come to other conclusions as far as the position of the ban before the fall of the temple is concerned.

Hunzinger shows first that חרם not until the middle of the third century described a ban severer in relation to נדוי.[37] Neither is there any record of the נזיפה, as a preparation for the ban, before the third century.[38] Therefore, from now on we can limit the discussion to נדוי.

Against what offences was נדוי used? Billerbeck, in his excursus reproduces evidence for the rabbinic tradition that 24 sins led to the ban.[39] Billerbeck could himself add another 8 reasons. Here the most varied reasons for laying on a ban meet. One could ban a person who spoke contemptuously of a rabbi, a person who owned something harmful (e.g. a mad dog), a person who calculated leap-years abroad, or someone who had relationships with his previous wife. The greatest weight seems to have been laid on respect for the Law and its representatives.[40] A large part of the material is also taken up by ritual laws.[41]

But even social transgressions,[42] offences against the unity of the Jewish nation[43] and sexual sins[44] could lead to the ban.[45]

Hunzinger sifts out five cases of ban from the time before the year 70 A.D. They are mentioned in the following traditions:[46]

1. Taan III 8.[47]

> Once they said to Onias the Circle-maker, "Pray that rain may fall". He answered, "Go out and bring in the Passover ovens that they be not softened". He prayed, but the rain did not fall. What did he do? He drew a circle and stood within it and said before God, "O Lord of the world, thy children have turned their faces to me, for that I am like a son of the house before thee. I swear by thy great name that I will not stir hence until thou have pity on thy children". Rain began falling drop by drop. He said, "Not for such rain have I prayed, but for rain that will fill the cisterns, pits, and caverns". It began to rain with violence. He said, "Not for such rain have I prayed, but for rain of goodwill, blessing, and graciousness". Then it rained in moderation [and continued] until the Israelites went up from Jerusalem to the Temple Mount because of the rain. They went to him and said, "Like as thou didst pray for the rain to come, so pray that it may go away!" He replied, "Go and see if the Stone of the Strayers has disappeared!" Simeon b. Shetah sent to him [saying], "Hadst thou not been Onias I had pronounced a ban against thee (גוזרנא עליך נדוי)! But what shall I do to thee? thou importunest God and he performeth thy will, like a son that importuneth his father and he performeth his will; and of thee Scripture saith, Let thy father and thy mother be glad, and let her that bare thee rejoice."

Onias is here said to be contemporary to Simeon b. Shetah, who lived about 80 A.D. Also Josephus dates Onias to this time.[48] The reason for his being threatened with a ban is given as being that he behaved far too familiarly and irreverently towards God. It is interesting to note that Onias refers to his position as "a son of the house" which reminds one of Jesus' claim that he stood in a special son relationship to God. However, the story of the ban on Onias stands rather isolated, and contains clear legendary traits. It is therefore possible that what is here said of reasons for the ban reflects later conditions.

2. Eduy V 6.

> Akabya b. Mahalaleel testified to four opinions. They answered (אמרו לו): Akabya, retract these four opinions that thou hast given and we will make thee Father of the Court in Israel. He said to them: Better that I be called a fool all my days than that

I be made a godless man before God even for an hour; for they shall not say of me, He retracted for the sake of office. He declared unclean the residuary hair [in a leprosy sign], and also the yellow blood; but the Sages declare them clean. If the hair of a blemished Firstling fell out and one put it in a wall-niche, and afterward slaughtered the beast, he used to permit the hair [to be used]; but the Sages forbid it. He said: They do not give a proselyte or a freed bondwoman to drink [of the water of bitterness]. And the Sages say: They give her to drink. They said to him: It happened to Karkemith, a freed bondwoman that was in Jerusalem, that Shemaiah and Abtalion gave her to drink. He replied: Only in show did they make her to drink (Or: Because of their opinion did they make her to drink[49]). Whereupon they laid him under a ban (ונדוהו); and he died while he was yet under the ban and the court stoned his coffin."

The dating of Akabya is much debated, but there is strong evidence that he lived before the fall of the temple.[50] Hunzinger wants to place him during the first half of the first century.

In bBer 19a the reason for the ban on Akabya is given as being that he expressed himself in a disparaging way about deceased scribes. But this concept reflects conditions which prevailed much later. Not until the latter half of the third century can we find bans for protecting a teacher's views. The real reason for the ban was Akabya's obstinate insistance on his own opinion against that of the majority.[51] We note what his opposition was directed against: three of the four deviating views concerned questions of purity.

3. Eduy V 6.[52]

Directly after the tradition about Akabya the Mishnah gives an utterance of R. Judah (b. Ilai, about 150 A.D.[53]), in which he denies that it was the devout Akabya who was banned. R. Judah continues:

> But whom did they put under a ban (ואת מי נדו)? Eleazar b. Enoch, because he threw doubts on [the teaching of the Sages concerning] the cleansing of hands. And when he died the court sent and laid a stone on his coffin; whence we learn that if any man is put under a ban and dies while yet under the ban, his coffin must be stoned.

Eleazar b. Enoch is usually considered as contemporary with Akabya; that is to say he probably lived before the year 70. Once again the one who is banned is a teacher who holds deviating views, and once again the deviation concerns the question of purity.

4. Midd II 2.

> Whosoever it was that entered the Temple Mount came in on the right and went round and came out on the left, save any whom aught befell, for he went round to the left. "What aileth thee that thou goest to the left?" "Because I am a mourner". "May he that dwelleth in this House give thee comfort!" "Because I am under a ban (שאני מנדה)." "May he that dwelleth in this House put it into their hearts to bring thee near again (ויקרבוך)!" So R. Meir, R. Jose said to him: Thou wouldest make it as though they had transgressed against him in judgement! - but, rather, [they say,] "May he that dwelleth in this House put it into thy heart to listen to the words of thy fellows (חבריך) that they may bring thee near again."

Thus this tradition claims to describe the conditions during the time of the temple and there is no reason for doubting the truth of this. That part of the tradition which is associated with R. Meir gives no indication as to the reason for the ban. On the other hand R. Jose's words imply that the one who was banned did not listen to the words of his colleagues. But this might only be R. Jose's private opinion around the year 150.

5. pMKat III 81d, 24-28.[54]

> R. Jose said: Theudas of Rome led the men of Rome to eat 'helmeted' lambs on the Passover nights. The Sages sent a message to him: Were you not Theudas, we would ban you (מנדין אותך). And who was Theudas? R. Hananiah said: He sent support to the rabbis. Have you not been found to be one who leads the people astray to eat that which is holy outside [Jerusalem]? Because everyone who leads the people astray to eat that which is holy outside [Jerusalem], deserves the ban (צריך נידוי)!

When did this event take place? bBer 19a places Theudas in connection with Simeon b. Shetah (about 80 A.D.). But here the text is uncertain and it is likely that Simeon's name came in from the tradition about Onias which is mentioned immediately before.[55] The text above mentions R. Hananiah, but there are, unfortunately, several of these to choose from. Hunzinger settles for dating this event as taking place just before the fall of the temple. There was a Hananiah at that time who fits in very well, namely the one who otherwise bore the title of Prefect of the Priesthood and who presumably held this post at the fall of the temple.[56] But due to the fact that this Hananiah lived also after the fall of the temple, the dating is uncertain. In actual fact it is very likely that Theudas took the destruction of the temple as a pretext for his liberal observance of Passover. We can therefore hold both possibilities open and date it to circa 70 A.D. Theudas was a rich and generous man, and

one obviously did not dare to ban him. The power of money. But his offence was worthy of a ban, and it consisted of opposition to the accepted halakah.

To get a clearer picture of the ban during the Tannaitic period Hunzinger presents a further seven traditions from the period 70-200 A.D.[57]

6. Eliezer b. Hyrcanos (c. 90 A.D.) was banned because he had a different viewpoint from the majority and would not give in.[58] Also his opposition referred to the question of purity. He declared a certain type of ovens as not susceptible to contamination while the others declared that they were susceptible.[59]

7. R. Akiba (died c. 135 A.D.) was threatened with a ban by Rabban Gamaliel II (c. 90 A.D.) when he, because of the sabbath, wanted to prevent a large number of people from reporting the new month.[60] Gamaliel motivated his threat by saying that Akiba "hindered the people from complying with a commandment".

8. Rabban Gamaliel II (c. 90 A.D.) banned even R. Jose b. Taddai, because he had with foolish conclusions brought ridicule over the rabbinic development of the law.[61]

9. Hananiah, the nephew of Joshua b. Hananiah emigrated to Babylonia about the year 110, and founded a school there.[62] When he himself began to lay down intercalary months, a message came from Palestine threatening him with ban.[63] The reason for this was that Hananiah had taken on himself that authority which the rabbinic acadamy in Palestine reserved for itself. The incident should have taken place around the year 140, at least, after the death of R. Akiba.

10. Like Jose b. Taddai, Pelimo brought down ridicule on the development of the law. He addressed the following question to Rabbi (Jehuda, died c. 217): "If a man has two heads on which one must he put the tefillin?" Rabbi answered: "You must either leave or regard yourself under the ban".[64]

11. Rabbi (Jehuda) had a maid servant who saw a man flogging his grown-up son. She banned him because by so doing he was transgressing the commandment "You shall not put a stumbling-block before the blind (Lev. 19:14)".[65] According to Hunzinger this is also a case of the one who is banned being a victim of the rabbinic interpretation of the law. But one must admit that the reason for the ban is not the same here as it was in the earlier examples. Here it is no teacher who is setting himself up against the interpretation of the other teachers, but a man who commits a social offence, by which he also breaks a commandment.

12. Finally, bKidd 28a gives a tradition which is not possible to date accurately: "If one calls his neighbour (חביר) 'slave', let him be placed under a ban". Here the offence which leads to a ban seems to lie wholly on the social plane.

In ten of the twelve above-mentioned cases, according to Hunzinger, the ban serves to protect the halakic tradition. The only exceptions are No. 1 (Onias) which, however, is historically unreliable, and No. 12. The conclusion is this: "In diesem Sinne haben wir im Bann vor dem Jahre 70 im wesentlichen ein Instrument im Dienste der Halakha zu sehen."[66] This practice remained until c. 200 A.D., when the field of application was enlarged so that the ban could protect the authority of the rabbis and the lawcourts. Later on it could be pronounced in all conceivable profane matters.

According to Hunzinger the year 70 thus makes no dividing line in this respect. Both before and after A.D. 70 one banned people on the grounds of opposition to the halakah.

On the whole one must agree with Hunzinger, but it is perhaps possible to go even a step further. If we inquire into the kind of opposition which brought on the threat of a ban or was belayed with a ban we find, namely, that opposition to questions of purity played a greater part before the year 70, while the traditions after the year 70 lay more stress on the character of the opposition as being defiance against the rabbinic authority.

If we tabulate the cases we have dealt with we can easily see this. We find that one's attitude to the regulations for purity were of importance in connection with the ban up to A.D. 70. As late as Eliezer b. Hyrcanos (No. 6) he was banned for a deviating interpretation on the question of purity. After that the solicitude for the authority and unity of the rabbinic interpretation becomes more important, before the ban comes to be used, around the year 200, against other types of offences. Such a development is in actual fact exactly what one could expect, bearing in mind the rabbinic struggle for orthodoxy after A.D. 70. But we can also see easily from the table that the problems of dating make every effort to describe the development unsure.

Bans before 200 A.D.

The persons affected	Time	Motivation
1. Onias	c. 80 B.C.	Lack of reverence for God
2. Akabya	before 70 A.D. ?	Deviating interpretation on rules of purity
3. Eleazar b. Enoch	before 70 A.D. ?	Deviating interpretation on rules of purity

4. The afflicted persons in the temple	before 70 A.D.	Motivation from c. 150 A.D.: Lack of obedience
5. Theudas	c. 70 A.D. ?	Deviating celebration of Passover
6. Eliezer b. Hyrcanos	c. 90 A.D.	Deviating interpretation on rules of purity
7. Akiba	c. 90 A.D.	Prevented the people from keeping a commandment
8. Jose b. Taddai	c. 90 A.D.	Brought ridicule on the development of the law
9. Hananiah	c. 140 A.D.	Laid down intercalary months abroad
10. Pelimo	c. 200 A.D.	Brought ridicule on the development of the law
11. The maltreater	c. 200 A.D.	Beat his grown-up son
12. He who calls his neighbour a slave	?	Contempt of one's neighbour

4. Conclusion

Information concerning total expulsion from the Pharisaic community is very meagre. A tax-collector, according to the older concept, was totally and definitely expelled from the community. Apparently in connection with a revision of rules of membership in the Pharisaic fellowships around the year 150 A.D. the rule was modified and it became possible for a former tax-collector to be received back into the community.

About the year 90, the birkat ha-minim was introduced as an effective means of expulsion from the normative Jewish community. By this, people were forced to withdraw from the community if they deviated from that orthodoxy laid down by the leading rabbis.

The Jewish ban was used up to the time of the fall of the temple, and for a short period thereafter, mainly against leaders who opposed themselves to the accepted rules of purity. Later on, and during the whole of the third century teachers were banned, who, because of their oppositional instruction, threatened the authority and unity of the rabbinic development of the law. However, from about the year 200 onwards, the ban received a more and more expanded area of application.

B. How was Expulsion Carried Out?

1. Judicial Instance

Here we will concentrate on the traditions about the ban because they give us the most ample information. According to Billerbeck, every Israelite had the right to lay a ban.[67] But Hunzinger shows very nicely how this right only gradually extended.[68] In the oldest traditions the right to ban seems to be limited to the scribes. Around 140 the disciples of the scribes also begin to appear with the same right.[69] And not until the third century do we come across the information that ordinary laymen "anybody" could lay a ban.[70]

Hunzinger maintains that bans during the oldest period were only a matter for the Sanhedrin.[71] Apparently, even before the fall of the temple, this right was extended to the scribes in general; in any case, by the year 90 we come across the first information that an individual scribe laid a ban.[72]

Hunzinger's thesis is based on the correct observation that in the oldest traditions it is not the individual scribe who lays the ban, but an instance which is spoken of in the third person plural: "they put under a ban". In the Akabya case it seems to be a question of scribes who had the authority to call Akabya to אב בית דין i.e. the vice president of the Sanhedrin.[73] "Es scheint also der בית דין das Synedrium, oder eine offizielle Abordnung desselben den Bann über ʿAqabja verhängt zu haben."[74] Also in the tradition of Eleazar b. Enoch the court (בית דין) seems to be the judging instance.[75] How the afflicted persons on the temple area were banned is not told.[76] But it is implied that "they" could lift the ban, and as the rule stated that only those who lay the ban can raise it, we can even here imagine a collegium of learned scribes as the judging instance. Theudas in Rome was threatened with a ban from the "Sages",[77] clearly an authority in Palestine which had supervision over the Jews in the Diaspora, namely the Sanhedrin. And finally: in the tradition about Eliezer b. Hyrcanos' ban we also find the judging instance to be "they".[78] Seeing that it is at the same time clear that Gamaliel II considered himself as responsible for the ban,[79] we can imagine that the Sanhedrin with Gamaliel as president executed the ban. The only exception seems to be the tradition about Onias, but in fact this is no exception.[80] Simeon b. Shetah, who here alone threatens with a ban, was considered by posterity to be one of two leaders of the Sanhedrin of his time. The threat has been laid in his mouth because be was considered to be acting in the name of the Sanhedrin.

But the question as to what the Sanhedrin was, is a difficult one. If one relies on the Greek sources, the Sanhedrin, before the year 70, constituted the highest official Jewish authority.[81] During the time of

the procurators, according to these sources, the area of responsibility of the Sanhedrin was limited to Judea. It consisted of High Priests, elders and scribes, and had as its chairman the High Priest in office. But if one keeps to the rabbinic documents one gets another picture. According to these sources "The Great Sanhedrin" was primarily an inofficial Pharisaic institution for interpreting the law and for instruction.[82] It consisted of scribes and was led by two prominent rabbis.

Hunzinger accepts the information from the rabbinic sources as to which instance had authority to lay a ban. But at the same time, he disregards information from the same sources as to how this instance was composed and what authority it had. As far as the composition and sphere of competence of the Sanhedrin are concerned, Hunzinger relies on the Greek sources and therefore comes to the conclusion that already during the time of the temple, the ban was a general Jewish institution. Without having to take a definite standpoint in the difficult question of the Sanhedrin, one can call attention to the fact that Hunzinger's mode of procedure is questionable. It is in no way certain that the execution of the ban lay in the hands of any official authority, recognized by all Jews. The Greek sources say nothing about the ban, and according to the rabbinic sources, it was utilized by a central institution, presumably made up of Pharisaic scribes.

2. Consequences and Function of the Ban

Here I will briefly give the concrete consequences of the ban, how long it lasted, and how it was raised. This will lead on to the question as to what function the ban had within Rabbinic Judaism.

In bMKat 15aff there is given a series of regulations as to one's relationship to those who mourn, those who are lepers and those who are banned. This very combination, which recurs in rule after rule, is interesting. In principle he who was banned was dealt with in the same way as the mourner and the leper. Even though the rules are laid down relatively late it is clear that they are based on an older practice. We have seen that already in the Manual (1QS III 5) he who was expelled was considered to be as unclean as a leper. And, according to Midd II 2 (p. 95) the one who was banned had to behave like a mourner when he visited the temple.

As was the case for mourners and lepers, the one who was banned was forbidden to cut his hair.[83] Like them, he had to cover his head. Like them, he was not allowed to wash his clothes. According to R. Joseph (died 333) it was also forbidden for a person under a ban, as it was for a mourner, to bathe and to wear sandals in the town, but there were divided opinions about this.

Referring to Taan II 7 R. Joseph also maintained that it was forbidden to exchange greetings with a banned person - as it was with mourners and lepers. Even if this was contradicted, it is likely that R. Joseph's opinion testifies of an older practice.

The description of how R. Eliezer (c. 90 A.D.) was banned by his colleagues after a doctrinal dispute, is touching. R. Akiba took it upon himself to tell him.

> bBM 59b.
> What did R. Akiba do? He donned black garments and wrapped himself in black, and sat at a distance of four cubits from him. "Akiba", said R. Eliezer to him, "What has particularly happened to-day?" "Master", he replied, "it appears to me that thy companions hold aloof from thee." Whereupon he too rent his garments, put off his shoes, removed his seat and sat on the earth whilst tears streamed from his eyes.

Thus R. Akiba intimates what has happened by putting on mourning. With gentle words he paraphrases the import of the ban: "Thy companions hold aloof from thee". When R. Eliezer comprehends what has happened, he too behaves as befits a mourner.[84]

In actual fact the distance one kept from a person who was banned was a characteristic of the ban. One had to keep a distance of at least four cubits from a banned person,[85] just as one had to keep one's distance from a leper.[86] To raise the ban was to let him once again come close (e.g. Midd II 2).

This literal distancing must have been extremely painful. The one affected was socially isolated. One could no longer eat together with him. In practice he must have found it hard to find business partners, disciples or companions.[87] Only his own family could come near him.

In spite of this literal distancing, the one who was banned was not completely expelled from the Jewish community. He could visit the temple area,[88] and according to a later tradition, he was allowed to sacrifice.[89] In principle he was allowed to receive instruction and even to teach.[90] If a person died while still under a ban, one had to place a stone on his coffin, a symbolic substitute for stoning.[91] The object of this act is not clearly stated. Did one, by carrying out the punishment, want to expiate the deviator's guilt? Physical suffering was seen as redemptive, but that a symbolic punishment after death should make expiation, seems unlikely. Rather, this action means that one definitely dissociated oneself from the person who was banned. Now there was no longer any possibility to receive him back. He had to take the consequences of his deviation. He was considered - though afterwards - as totally expelled.

According to bMKat 16a a ban lasted at least 30 days.[92] Hunzinger points out that nothing in the oldest traditions contradicts this rule. The ban could last longer. Akabya and Eleazar died while under the ban. But

we know of no case from the Tannaitic period in which the ban lasted less than 30 days. Later on the ban came to be treated less restrictively. The ban could then be lifted without the lapse of a minimum length of time.

From the middle of the third century and onwards we find the information that a person who was banned had himself to request for the ban to be lifted. No such condition seems to have existed during the Tannaitic period. According to Midd II 2 (R. Meir, c. 150 A.D.) the whole initiative lay with those who could once again "bring near" the one who was banned. The only condition was that he who was banned again wanted to "listen to the words of his fellows" (R. Jose, c. 150 A.D.).[93] When a banned person showed by his behaviour that he repented, e.g. denied his oppositional teaching, he could, after 30 days, be freed from his ban.

Around the question of the ban's function there reigns a certain amount of confusion. נדוי is most often translated as "excommunicated" or something similar. This happens often, for example, in the Soncino edition of the Bab. Talmud. E. Schürer equates the ban with expulsion from the Jewish community.[94] G. F. Moore speaks of the ban as excommunication.[95] S. Krauss describes it as a temporary exclusion,[96] and L. Finkelstein calls it "expulsion".[97]

Contrary to this interpretation Billerbeck maintains that the ban, נדוי, was something completely different from an expulsion.[98] The purpose of the ban was never that of excluding anyone from the synagogue, on the contrary, its aim was to tie them closer to it.[99] Also Hunzinger stresses that the ban never aimed at complete exclusion from the synagogue. But he expresses himself with more of a nuance. A banned person still took part in Israel's public and religious life, but this participation took place at a distance. The ban distanced the guilty one from communion with his fellow-countrymen.[100]

With the terminology we are using here it is clear that the ban functioned as a partial expulsion; the person who was banned was cut off from certain sectors of the community, but remained in others. Furthermore this form of expulsion was temporary, seeing it could be lifted after a month if the one banned showed improvement. It was also a formal expulsion which only a definite institution could command, even if we can see that the circle of those who laid a ban gradually widened and thus the ban became informalized.

Thus it is clear that after the fall of the temple, the ban functioned as a form of expulsion from the normative Jewish community. But how did it work before the year 70? Hunzinger means to say that even before 70 A.D. the ban was a general Jewish phenomenon. It was administered by the highest official Jewish authority, it could affect anybody who set himself up against the halakic tradition, and it meant that, for the one who was banned, all relationships with all other Jews were affected. But this assumption leads to difficulties. Is there actually a basis for such an

expulsion before the year 70? Was the halakic tradition so uniform that opponents against it could with success be thrust out of the community? After all, the Sadducees had their halakah, the Essenes had theirs, and not even the Pharisees were united.

D. R. A. Hare has therefore brought up the idea that before 70 A.D. the ban functioned as a means of expulsion from the Pharisaic fellowships.[101] The same view was maintained already in 1864 by J. Wiesner,[102] which Hare did not know about - and which was energetically repudiated by Hunzinger in 1954.[103] But this thought has several good arguments on its side.

First of all we have seen that up to 70 A.D. and a short period thereafter, the ban was mainly directed against scribes who deviated on the question of the interpretation of the rules of purity. Seeing we know that these rules were of greatest interest to the Pharisees while the rest of the Jews laid less importance on them, it is reasonable to assume that the ban was particularly practiced by the Pharisees. The ban on Eleazar b. Enoch is particularly inconceivable as a non-Pharisaic sanction. Eleazar was banned because he threw doubts on the teaching of the cleansing of the hands. But before the fall of the temple these rules applied only within the Pharisaic fellowships.[104]

Secondly, we have noticed that the judging instance, according to the oldest rabbinic traditions, seems to have been a central Pharisaic institution for interpretation of the law and for instruction. Even if the rabbinic picture of the Sanhedrin is much debated, there is practically no reason for doubting the information given in passing, about a collegium of Pharisaic scribes who acted as a judging instance.

Thirdly, we have seen that measures taken against those that were banned were the same as those that were taken against mourners and lepers. Now, these measures could be conceived in different ways. They could be seen as ritualized expressions for sorrow. The mourner went around barefoot, with ragged clothes and unkempt hair, to show that sorrow had so filled his heart that he became disinterested in his outward appearance. It could also be understood as penitential rites. One thought that God would be moved when he saw the afflicted one in his wretched condition, so that he would again send blessings, and, for example, allow the leper to be healed. But the measures could also be seen as safety measures in the face of possible sources of contamination. Those that were pure had to be careful of the leper, so that they themselves did not contract leprosy, and of the mourner, because he had perhaps been in contact with a corpse. But measures for denoting a potential source of contamination are just what we could expect from the Pharisaic community before 70 A.D., which was, after all, established just for the sake of purity.

Fourthly: Eduy V 7 tells of the banned Akabya's conversation with his son while on his deathbed. The son asks his father: "Father,

commend me to thy fellow Sages (חבריך(ל) אבא פקוד עלי)". The father refuses with this motivation: "Thine own deeds will bring thee near [to them], or thy own deeds will remove thee far [from them] (מעשיך יקרבוך ומעשיך ירחקוך)". Here it is assumed that Akabya still remains in the community and there has such authority that he can open the way for his son. The terminology is strongly reminiscent of Qumran.[105] The context shows that it is a question of that community from which Akabya had derived his deviating interpretations which had cost him the ban. Thus the situation seems to be this, that there are two competing groups. One has laid a ban on Akabya. The other accepts him completely. Whatever this other group is (the school of Shammai?) it seems unlikely that the ban on Akabya had any effect there. The ban does not appear to be a general Jewish measure.

Hunzinger's main argument is terminological. Those texts which expressly deal with expulsion from the Pharisaic community do not use the term נדוי but various forms of דחה, "thrust out". Furthermore, the term קבל, "receive", "take up", is used to denote readmission into the fellowship, while it is never used in connection with נדוי. This argument is worthy of note but it is not conclusive. We have seen that the texts referred to are few in number and that they partly represent the same tradition.[106] A certain terminological variation is natural. For example חרם and שמתא are now and again used synonymously with נדוי. But it is above all a question of two completely separate forms of expulsion. In the one case, total and originally definite expulsion; in the other, partial and temporary expulsion. There is also a terminological connection in the verb קרב which is used both for the lifting of a ban,[107] and for readmission into the Pharisaic fellowships.[108]

In spite of Hunzinger's objections, it is therefore most likely that before the year 70 the ban belonged to the Pharisaic fellowships - even if the Pharisees outside the fellowships and their sympathizers, could have observed the rules for bans. (See Additional Note, p. 114.)

3. Conclusion

The Jewish community before 70 A.D. was, from a religious point of view, a diversified community. Of course it did happen, as in all communities, that deviators were countered with various, informal sanctions which ranged from freezing a person out, to lynching. And, naturally, a person who seriously transgressed the laws could be condemned to death. But otherwise there does not seem to have been any formal way of thrusting a person out of the religious community.

The Pharisaic fellowships were a different matter. There the unity in teaching and life was greater, and it was possible to take action against a deviator. For example, he who was a tax-collector had to be

definitely expelled from the community. Here too, the ban was developed as a sanction against oppositional scribes. Such were dealt with as potentially unclean (as were mourners and lepers) for a month, which was most likely when the opposition was a question of the interpretation of the rules of purity. The "Sitz im Leben" of the ban before the year 70 was the learned discussions in the Pharisaic fellowships.

After the year 70 it was the Pharisees who reorganized and put their stamp on Judaism. Now the ban gradually came to be detached from the Pharisaic fellowships. It was still directed against individuals who opposed themselves to the halakah as accepted by the Pharisees. It still had the function of a partial expulsion with a specific time-limit. But it could now be directed also against people who stood outside the fellowships. And it had a distancing effect on the one concerned - not now from the fellowships - but from the larger Jewish community.

Excursus: Some New Testament Information on Expulsion from the Jewish Community

In three passages in the Gospel of John we come across the term ἀποσυνάγωγος (9:22; 12:42; 16:2). Bauer, Bohren and Doskocil, among others, assume that this term alludes to banning.[109] But Billerbeck and Hunzinger rightly reject this interpretation.[110] First and foremost, this term obviously implies total expulsion, while the ban signified partial expulsion. One who was banned still belonged to the synagogue. We can add a few more arguments to this one. We have seen that the ban was above all directed against the religious teachers who opposed themselves to, for example, the rules of purity. But the parents of the man born blind (9:22) were no leaders, and, according to the evangelist it was confession of Christ - not transgressions of the rules of purity - which could cause a person to be ἀποσυνάγωγος. Furthermore, it is likely that during the time of Jesus the ban was only practiced within the Pharisaic fellowships. But there is nothing to indicate that either the man born blind or his parents were Pharisees.

From the three passages in John the following seems to be evident: a) The evangelist was aware of a Jewish decision to completely expel Christians from the synagogue (9:22). b) On the basis of this decision the power to put expulsion into practice lay with the Pharisees (12:42). c) The evangelist knew that this kind of expulsion did not come into normal use until after the death of Christ (16:2). We know already that just at the time the gospel of John was written, the birkat ha-minim was driving the Jewish Christians out of the synagogue. It is therefore difficult to avoid the conclusion that the bitter experiences of this sanction are those which influence the evangelist's presentation. In a rather anachronistic way he has used a term which was topical in his own time when he was reproducing the Jesus tradition.[111]

Luke 6:22 has often been connected with the formal Jewish action against Christians. Here Hunzinger has an ingenious and interesting hypothesis.[112] He maintains that the word, in the first stage of the tradition constituted a generally formulated beatitude over those who would be persecuted for Jesus' sake. Matt. 5:11 corresponds to this form of the word. After that it has been expanded with reference to Isa. 66:5, which was taken advantage of because the Christians there saw the Jewish ban foretold. The passage reads: אמרו אחיכם שנאיכם מנדיכם למען שמי . RSV: "Your brethren who hate you and cast you out for my name's sake have said ---."

Finally, the evangelist took the word in hand, but in his version of the amplification the allusion to the ban is missing: ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς . Luke saw the word as once again a beatitude over the persecuted.

If Hunzinger is right, Luke 6:22 constitutes the only evidence for the fact that the Jewish ban affected the Christians. But this very circumstance should make one extra suspicious. Luke's deviation from LXX weakens the hypothesis. And even if the word, somewhere in the process of tradition, was influenced by the OT passage, one cannot know for sure if it was seen as a prophecy about the ban or as a word about informal dissociation.

C. Which Theological Motifs were Connected with Expulsion?

The story is told that when R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanos had been banned, Rabban Gamaliel II (the president of the Great Sanhedrin and the brother-in-law of Eliezer) found himself on a ship. A huge wave was in danger of sinking the ship. Gamaliel understood that this had a connection with the ban which he had a part in laying, and he called out:

> Sovereign of the Universe! Thou knowest full well that I have not acted for my honour, nor for the honour of my paternal house, but for Thine, so that strife may not multiply in Israel (bBM 59b).

Gamaliel's words are typical of the traditions of expulsion from the Jewish community. Concern for the unity of the community is a constant recurring motif. As we have seen, the birkat ha-minim constituted one means of achieving an orthodox unity, and bans were mainly directed against those who opposed themselves to the halakah as accepted by the majority.

But in a few places in the older traditions, a more particular

theological motif is observable. The tradition about Onias contains no indications that his offence consisted of opposition to the halakah. As we have seen the outward cause of the threatened ban was Onias' lack of reverence for God. bTaan 23a which gives the tradition in somewhat more detail than does the Mishnah, lets Simeon b. Shetah utter the following words:

> Were it not that you are Honi, I would have placed you under the ban; for were the years like the years [of famine in the time] of Elijah (in whose hands were the keys of rain) would not the name of Heaven be profaned through you?

Thus Onias had to be belaid with a ban because by his behaviour he could lead the people to profane the name of the Holy One. The holiness motif is used to describe Onias' offence.

A similar thought is connected to the tradition about Theudas:

> Because everyone who leads the people astray to eat that which is holy outside [Jerusalem] , deserves the ban (pMKat III 81d).

Admittedly Theudas' crime consisted in the fact that with his celebration of Passover he set himself up against the endeavours at centralization. But it could also be comprehended and described as an offence against holiness. The holy belongs to the holy.

The traditions about R. Eliezer are particularly enlightening here. Also here do we glimpse the holiness motif in slight contradiction to the above quoted words of Gamaliel. bBM 59b mentions in passing what happened at the actual banning:

> On that day all the objects which R. Eliezer had declared clean were brought and burnt in fire. Then they took a vote and blessed (=cursed) him.[113]

The banning is here seen as a parallel to the burning of the unclean things which Eliezer had considered as clean. In one respect R. Eliezer could be seen as one who did not conform to the endeavours at centralization. In another respect he could be considered as one who, through his teaching, was a threat to the purity of the community. Palest. Talmud naively combines both motifs in an effort to save the face of R. Eliezer: "Did not R. Eliezer know, that you decide according to the majority? Yes, but he was angry, because they burned the objects which he declared clean" (pMKat III 81c).[114]

Now, the thought of the Jewish unity as a central motif for expulsion belongs to the period after 70 A. D. when the Jewish pluralism was eliminated. Gamaliel II himself belonged to the most prominent

supporters of unity. That he was a controversial man is evident already from the fact that he succeeded in pushing aside Johanan b. Zakkai while he was still alive and to appropriate to himself the post of leader of the Jabne academy.[115] We have seen that he took the initiative for the insertion of the birkat ha-minim, and that he did not just ban R. Eliezer but also Jose b. Taddai and furthermore threatened R. Akiba with a ban.[116] Finally his ruthlessness became too great and he was removed from office under dramatic circumstances.[117]

Thus it is in agreement with the rest of what we know about Gamaliel II that he is credited with the most clearly formulated reference to Israel's unity as a motivation for a ban: "That strife may not multiply in Israel". We cannot go far wrong if we assume that R. Gamaliel was the one most responsible for the dominance of the unity concept, and that the holiness motif, which we glimpse now and again, is the older motif. During the time of the temple, when the ban was associated with the Pharisaic fellowships, the holiness motif was dominant. He who set himself up against the norms for purity which guided the Pharisees, was himself considered as potentially unclean. One had to avoid him until he had shown that one could associate with him without any risk. After 70 A.D. the leaders in Jabne took over the ban and altered it to a form of partial expulsion from the whole of Israel. Now it was connected with the thought of Israel's unity, and the holiness motif became less topical.

Notes to Chapter III

1) Josephus Ant. XIII 288. See J. Jeremias, Jerusalem, 279ff.
2) The Mishnah's traditions about the Pharisees are collected by E. Schürer, Geschichte II, 452-455. For rabbinic traditions about the Pharisaic fellowships and "the people of the land", see P. Billerbeck, Kommentar II, 494-519; about the Pharisees, see IV 334-339; for the ban, see IV 293-333. Josephus' information on the Pharisees is collected by E. Schürer, Geschichte II, 449-452. For editions, see the bibliography.
3) E. Schürer, Geschichte II, 471; J. Jeremias, Jerusalem, 279.
4) E.g. bPes 49b, "R. Eliezer said: An ʿam ha-arez, it is permitted to stab him even on the Day of Atonement which falls on the Sabbath. Said his disciples to him, Master, say to slaughter him [ritually]? - He replied: This [ritual slaughter] requires a benediction, whereas that [stabbing] does not require a benediction." Cf. S. Lieberman, Discipline. 204ff.
5) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar II, 506f, maintains that the Tosephta's information on this subject was derived from R. Meir (c. 150 A.D.) while the Mishnah's information was derived from the schools of Hillel and Shammai. C. Rabin, Studies, 11-20, follows Tosephta's account. J. Neusner, Fellowship, 131, agrees with the thought that Tosephta's account applies to an introductory period as a student, while the Mishnah deals with a later stage, the novitiate.
6) The term נאמן in this meaning, is first found during the second century A.D. Its equivalent during the first century A.D. is the term מעשר, "he who pays tithe". P. Billerbeck, Kommentar II, 504f.
7) Tos Dem II 12. The material is clearly arranged in C. Rabin, Studies, 12-15.
8) J. Jeremias, Jerusalem, 286ff.
9) Cf. Ch. II p. 57.
10) For this, see J. Neusner, Life, 147-149 et passim.
11) See P. Billerbeck, Kommentar II, 508f; C. Rabin, Studies, 16, cf. 37-52, 69f; J. Neusner, Fellowship, 135.
12) M. Jastrow, Dictionary. 421.
13) M. Jastrow, Dictionary, 416.
14) C. Rabin, Studies, 61f. Cf. John 7:49 and P. Billerbeck's exhaustive commentary on it, Kommentar II, 494ff.
15) M. Jastrow, Dictionary, 1222. See further L. Finkelstein, Pharisees II, 665 note 52.
16) M. Jastrow, Dictionary, 1228; R. T. Herford, Pharisees, 475.
17) This translation is given by C. Rabin, Studies, 15. One can also follow a var. lect. (=pDem II 3, 23a, Lamm 22c, 12) and translate it thus: "he is expelled from the order". Cf. M. Jastrow, Dictionary, 422f, sub voce חבורה.
18) pDem II 3, 23a (Lamm 22c, 13f) adds: "Hiyya bar Aboun said in the name of R. Johanan: If a haber leaves the country, he is not expelled from the order". To leave Palestine was considered as undesirable. However, the offence was not serious enough to motivate an expulsion.
19) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar II, 506.
20) For the difference between toll-collector and tax-collector, see J. R. Donahue, Taxcollectors. In the above quotation it is a question of a tax-collector (Hebr. גבי, Aram. גביא).
21) Cf. Toh VII 6; Hag III 6, and the discussion in J. R. Donahue, Taxcollectors, 50f.
22) Thus it did happen that a tax-collector was forbidden to witness in court. bSanh 25b; J. Jeremias, Jerusalem, 345f.
23) Cf. how expulsion in Qumran entailed that the guilty one was placed on the novice level.
24) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar II, 508.
25) See R. Meyer, TWNT IX, 32-35.
26) See P. Billerbeck, Kommentar IV, 208-249. For the text, see G. Dalman, Worte I, 299ff.

27) According to W. D. Davies, Setting, 275, who however takes משמדים as an active partic. and translates it as "persecutors"! I take the word to be passive, "apostates", "persons forced to apostasy". Cf. M. Jastrow, Dictionary, 850, 1591f.
28) Dial. Trypho XVI 4; CVIII 2.
29) It is not possible to arrive at the original wording, because it was considered a virtue to change the wording and thus preserve the spontaneity of the prayer. P. Billerbeck, Kommentar IV, 218 c.
30) For the discussion about this, see M. Goldstein, Jesus, 45-51. Bibliography on p. 278 note 54.
31) W. D. Davies, Setting, 276. According to G. Vermes, Decalogue, the minim were hellenistic Jews who were gnostically influenced, and who rejected the additions of the oral tradition to the decalogue.
32) Later, during the Amoraic period when the Jewish unity was assured, minim began to mean people of non-Jewish beliefs, mostly Christians. K. G. Kuhn, Giljonim, 39.
33) pBer IV 7c, 63 (Lamm 7b, 6f). P. Billerbeck, Kommentar IV, 220f, 6d. The people's reactions to the way Gamaliel forced through his own ideas were very strong. They arose and said to Gamaliel: "Who has not often had to experience your malice?"
34) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar IV, 293-333.
35) C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis. Unfortunately the study is not published, but the results are reported in ThLZ 80 (1955), 114f. References below are to the typed thesis.
36) J. E. Mignard, Discipline, This thesis is not printed either. For a summary, see Diss. Abstr. 27 A 1437. Hunzinger's thesis is not included in Mignard's bibliography and does not seem to have influenced his investigation. However, it is mentioned on p. 114 note 1. Presumably it did not come to his notice until the final phase of his work.
37) C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 6f.
38) C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 46.
39) P. Billerbeck. Kommentar IV, 309ff.
40) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar IV, 309ff, points a, b, d, e, f, q, s, v, x, α, β, δ, ε, η, θ.
41) Points k, l, m, n, o, p, t, u, γ.
42) Points c, g, r, y.
43) Points h, i, ζ.
44) Point w.
45) Hunzinger has a different grouping.
46) C.-H. Hunzinger. Bannpraxis, 24ff. The story of how R. Joshua b. Perahiah (c. 85 B.C.) commanded 400 horns to be blown and banned Jesus (bSot 47a; bSanh 107b) is generally considered as completely unhistorical, and that is why it is not treated here. Hunzinger, in note 184, quotes F. Delitzsch (1866): "Aber dieses Excommunications-

concert ist eine Lächerlichkeit, und das Ganze, da jener Josua ein ganzes Jahrhundert vor Jesus lebte, eine plumpe Fabel". See also M. Goldstein, Jesus, 73-77.
47) Cf. bTaan 23ab; pTaan III 66d, 43ff (Lamm 66c, 9ff); bBer 19a. The translation here and elsewhere when the Mishnah is quoted, is taken from H. Danby, Mishnah.
48) Josephus Ant. XIV 22.
49) דוגמה השקוה. דוגמה can be interpreted as δεῖγμα or δόγμα See C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 26f.
50) For a critical discussion, see H. Mantel, Studies, 107-118.
51) C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 26f, 34f. Cf. Eduy V 7.
52) Cf. pMKat III 81d, 28-30 (Lamm 81b, 32f); bBer 19a.
53) The identification is however debated. See H. Mantel, Studies, 109f.
54) Lamm 81b, 27-32. Cf. pPes VII 34a, 47ff (Lamm 33c, 55ff); bBer 19a; bPes 53a; bBetz 23a; Tos Betz II 15 (204).
55) C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 94 note 192.
56) See W. Bacher, Agada I, 51-53; H. Strack, Introduction, 109.
57) C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 33ff.
58) pMKat III 81c, 58-81d, 4 (Lamm 81a, 69ff); bBM 59ab; pShab II 5b, 52 (Lamm 4d, 61ff); bSanh 68a. All the material is collected in P. Billerbeck, Kommentar IV, 313-317.
59) Kel V 10.
60) pMKat III 81d, 22-24 (Lamm 81b, 24ff): Cf. RSh I 6.
61) Derek Erez 1 (18c). P. Billerbeck, Kommentar IV 317.
62) W. Bacher, Agada I, 385-389.
63) bBer 63a. Concerning the unreliability of the parallel traditions see W. Bacher, Agada I. 385f note 4.
64) bMen 37a. The translation here and elsewhere when the Bab. Talmud is quoted is taken from the Soncino edition.
65) bMKat 17a.
66) C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 38.
67) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar IV, 297.
68) C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 39ff.
69) The tradition about Hananiah (bBer 63a, see above p. 96, No. 9) forms a transition. Those who executed the ban seem to have been disciples sent out for that specific purpose. They speak on their teachers' behalf.
70) The first one who lays a ban without being either a scribe or a disciple is Rabbi's (died c. 217) famous maidservant. See above p. 96, No. 11.
71) C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 44.
72) Gamaliel II on Jose b. Taddai (see above p. 96, No. 8).
73) See above p. 93f, No. 2.
74) C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 42.
75) See above p. 94, No. 3.

76) See above p. 95, No. 4.
77) See above p. 95f, No. 5.
78) See above p. 96, No. 6.
79) See above p. 106.
80) See above p. 93, No. 1.
81) E. Schürer, Geschichte II, 237-267.
82) Literature on the subject is vast. For the older literature, see E. Schürer, Geschichte II, 237f. For newer literature, see S. B. Hoenig, Sanhedrin, 121-132; H. Mantel, Studies, particularly pp. 54-101; E. Lohse, TWNT VII, 858-869. I find no reason for here taking a stand on the complicated question of the relationship between the Sanhedrin of the Greek sources and the Great Sanhedrin of the rabbinic sources.
83) bMKat 15ab; cf. MKat III 1f.
84) Rend clothes: Gen. 37:34; Job 1:20; Lev. 10:6, etc.
Take off shoes: 2 Sam. 15:30; Ezek. 24:17; Micah 1:8.
Sit on the bare ground: Isa. 3:26; 47:1; Lam. 2:10.
Weep: 2 Sam. 12:15-23; 15:30 etc.
85) The same figure is mentioned as far as the leper is concerned in LevR 16:116c, 14f. C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 105, note 304.
86) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar IV, 751ff.
87) Hunzinger sees in the tradition about R. Eliezer (bSanh 68a) an indication of the effects of the ban. R. Eliezer bemoans the fact that he has been forced into inactivity. "Woe to you, two arms of mine, that have been like two Scrolls of the Law that are wrapped up. Much Torah have I studied, and much have I taught. Much Torah have I learnt, yet have I but skimmed from the knowledge of my teachers as much as a dog lapping from the sea. Much Torah have I taught, yet my disciples have only drawn from me as much as a painting stick from its tube." But Eliezer's inactivity was probably more due to his illness than his ban. Even after being banned he was active as an esteemed teacher. Cf. J. Wiesner, Bann, 18f.
88) Midd II 2.
89) bMKat 15b.
90) bMKat 15a.
91) Eduy V 6. bMKat 15a.
92) "Our Rabbis taught: No 'separation' ban holds less than thirty days."
93) See above p. 95, No. 4.
94) E. Schürer, Geschichte II, 507.
95) G. F. Moore, Judaism II, 183, note 1.
96) JL I, 706; UJE IV, 206.
97) L. Finkelstein, Pharisees I, 77-80.
98) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar IV, 329ff.
99) "Danach sollte der Bann als innersynagogales Zuchtmittel wohl bessern u. zum Gehorsam gegen die Tora u. ihre Vertreter zurückführen, also recht eigenlich bei der Synagoge festhalten, aber die Aufgabe, aus der Synagoge auszuschliessen, wird ihm nirgends zugewiesen." P. Billerbeck, Kommentar IV, 330.
100) C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 51.
101) D. R. A. Hare, Persecution, 48ff.
102) J. Wiesner, Bann, 14-17. Cf. L. Finkelstein, Pharisees I, 77ff.
103) C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 95f, note 198.
104) According to pShab I, 3d, 39, Hillel and Shammai laid down rules concerning purification of the hands. But these rules were only applicable to their fellowships. See R. Meyer, TWNT IX, 19 note 46, where, however, Eliezer is dated as living after the fall of the temple.
105) פקד , cf. איש הפקיד in 1QS, see p. 54, and CD XV 8, where entrance into the covenant is spoken of as a "registration".
קרב , cf. p. 55 and below note 107f.
רחק , cf. p. 55.
106) See above p. 89f.
107) Midd II 2; pMKat III, 81d, 14, 32f (Lamm 81b, 15).
108) pDem II 3, 23a (Lamm 22c, 10); cf. pKidd IV 1, 65b (Lamm 64d, 50); S. Lieberman, Discipline, 199f note 8; 202 note 26.
109) W. Bauer, Wörterbuch, 199. R. Bohren, Kirchenzucht, 26. W. Doskocil, Bann, 40-43.
110) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar IV, 329-331. C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 71.
111) D. R. A. Hare, Persecution, 54f, objects that birkat ha-minim only meant that certain people voluntarily left the community, while John implies that they were thrust out against their will. But it is not sure that this distinction was made by the evangelist. When the Gospel of John was written down the Jewish Christians had in practice been forced to leave the Jewish community. It is hardly likely that they experienced it as voluntary withdrawal.
112) C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 72-74.
113) Also bBer 19a.
114) Lamm 81b, 3.
115) The relations between Johanan b. Zakkai and Gamaliel II are not mentioned much. But the controversies between Gamaliel and Johanan's faithful disciples, Joshua and Eliezer, imply that Johanan and Gamaliel were not particularly good friends and that Johanan was forced to leave his post. See J. Neusner, Life, 167.
116) See above p. 96.
117) bBer 27b.

Additional Note to Chapter III

After my manuscript was handed in for printing, C.-H. Hunzinger's essay "Spuren pharisäischer Institutionen in der frühen rabbinischen Überlieferung" came to my notice. Hunzinger here reconsiders the problem of the ban before 70 A.D. and corrects his earlier position. With arguments similar to some of those we have advanced above, he now concedes that the ban before 70 A.D. could be a Pharisaic sanction controlled by a Pharisaic central institution.

IV. Expulsion from the Religious Community within Primitive Christianity

In this chapter we will turn our attention to Primitive Christianity. We will limit ourselves to that Christianity as portrayed in the NT. We will also make use of some of the writings of the Apostolic Fathers when they throw light on the rules for expulsion. But in general this group of writings represent a later stage of development. So as to not make the picture unclear, we will here focus our attention on that Christianity and those communities which the NT gives evidence of.

However, Primitive Christianity was no homogenous entity but varied from one time to another and from one place to another. Already round the historical Jesus there was a fellowship. From our point of view it is not crucial whether Jesus wanted to found a church or not. The community around him was a social fact and it is conceivable that we can find already there certain forms of expulsion. After Easter the community gradually took on a more definite framework, but during the whole period of Primitive Christianity a certain manifoldness reigned. In dealing with the texts we have to take this manifoldness into consideration, partly so that we do not harmonize everything into a unified whole, and partly so that we do not force the texts into a development along a straight line.

Because of difficulty in interpreting the texts we have first picked out five which deal with disciplinary questions: Matt. 18; 2 Thess. 3:6-15; 1 Cor. 5; 1 John 5:16-17; Rev. 2-3. These texts are suitable for analysis, because they represent different groups of writings and all of them throw light on our subject with comparative detail. In analysing these texts I am chiefly interested to find the answer to my three questions: Which deviations led to expulsion? How was expulsion carried out? Which theological motifs were connected with expulsion? But I include in the analysis also an attempt at understanding what aims the texts have apart from questions about the limits of the community. I take pains to see each text in its context and to judge it according to its character.

Then after the five texts have been analysed, I put together what the different sections in the NT have to say about expulsion. Seeing that the framework is given in the five analysed texts, I can now rather more freely add on other texts and items. These do not constitute the backbone of the presentation but they fill out the picture.

A. Analysis of Some Important Texts

1. Matt. 18

A complete analysis of this very full chapter would go far beyond the limits of this investigation. Just recently, W. G. Thompson has devoted a whole book to this chapter.[1] However, this book brings to the fore the question as to whether Matt. 18 at all constitutes a literary unit. This question is of importance to us seeing we in the following lay great stress on the evangelist's own understanding of the material he collected together. Therefore, in the first section I take up Thompson's thesis and try to show, against it, that Matt. 18 does constitute a literary unit, which is held together by definite motifs. After that, I concentrate my presentation on the sections of the chapter which directly deal with the subject of our research, while at the same time the context has to contribute to the understanding of these sections.

a. Matt. 18 - a Literary Unit

Thompson sees the whole section - Matt. 17:22 to 18:35 - as a unit and proposes the following outline:

PREDICTION: Prediction of the passion, death and resurrection (17:22-23)

INSTRUCTIONS:

- a Peter: Payment of the Half-Shekel Tax (17:24-27)
- b Disciples:
  - General Norm: True Greatness in the Kingdom of Heaven (18:1-4)
  - Specific Situations:
    - a The Evil of Scandal (18:5-9)
    - b The Care of Sheep Going Astray (18:10-14)
    - a' Reconciling a Brother (18:15-20)
- a' Peter: Forgiveness in the Kingdom of Heaven (18:21-35)[2]

The critical points in this outline are a) the transition between Matt. 17 and 18 and b) the connection between 18:20 and 18:21.

a) Thompson explains Matt. 17:24-27 like this.[3] After the fall of the temple the Romans took over the yearly temple tax. In this way it lost its symbolic meaning as a declaration of solidarity for Judaism. But the symbolic function of the temple tax was soon replaced by a freewill charge for the academy in Jabne ("aurum coronarium"). Now the question

arose: How should one relate oneself to these new collections? Matthew gives the Jewish-Christian community the following answer: The Christians are as "sons", freed from the obligation to pay, but, so as not to give offence they are allowed to pay their part. They are freed from Judaism but they do not need to challenge Jewish opinion.

According to Thompson, such an answer must have made the disciples wonder about the criterion for true greatness.[4] That is why Matthew straight away continues with a section on greatness in the kingdom of God and conditions for entering it (18:1-4).

But Thompson's argument is not convincing. What is central in Matt. 17:24-27 is not the question of greatness or any other theoretical question, but a practical and ethical one: is one to pay tax or not? Some of the wording, "the kings of the earth", "toll or tax (κῆνσον = Lat. censum)" indicates that the text in its present form alludes to state taxes.[5] To me it seems simplest to assume that Matthew has taken up a tradition from the time before the fall of the temple, reformed it and used it as an example of how one, with one's freedom preserved, observed regulations laid down by law so as not to be a stumbling-block for anyone (ἵνα δὲ μὴ σκανδαλίσωμεν). In this way he prepares for the instruction in 18:6-9.[6]

Even if Matthew did have in mind the tax for Jabne it is difficult to see how this could lead on to the question about greatness. Seeing the formula ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ (18:1) in Matthew often introduces a new section (3:1; 11:25; 12:1; 14:1), we can assume that this is also the case here.[7] The connection between Chapters 17 and 18 is weaker than Thompson maintains.

b) According to Thompson the parable of the lost sheep (18:10-14) constitutes the central point in the section 18:5-20. Thompson rightly sees the connection between verses 10-14 and 15-20 in the following thought. In the same way as the shepherd rejoices over a little lamb who had strayed and was found again, the Father wants the disciples to take care of those who have been brought to ruin and try to lead them back. We find in 18:15-20 the practical application of the more theoretical instruction which the parable gives.[8] However, a whole new section starts at verse 21, according to Thompson.[9] The instruction to the disciples, which has lasted from 18:1, comes to an end and a new dialogue with Peter begins.

However, Thompson has to admit that quite a few "echoes" connect verses 21-35 with earlier sections in the chapter.[10] Such echoes are:

v. 21	ἁμαρτήσει ... ὁ ἀδελφός μου	cf. v. 15,
v. 23	ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν	cf. vs. 1, 3, 4,
v. 28	ἕνα τῶν συνδούλων αὐτοῦ	cf. vs. 6. 10, 14,
v. 35	ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος	cf. vs. 10, 14, 19.[11]

At least the first of these echoes make it impossible to draw a sharp division between v. 20 and v. 21.

In actual fact the whole of Ch. 18 is interwoven with various key words in such a way that one must consider it as a distinct section. Here one can conveniently differentiate between various types of key words. On the one hand we find words which dominate a tradition unit, and are found here because the tradition deals with a specific subject (subject words). By placing traditions with the same subject words next to each other, the evangelist indicates that, according to him, they belong together ("hook-word connection"). Thus σκάνδαλον - σκανδαλίζω connects v. 6 with v. 7 and vs. 8-9. Ἀφίημι in the sense of "forgive" (vs. 21, 27, 32, 35) connects vs. 21 and 22 with vs. 23-35. But it is even more important to observe which key words or expressions the evangelist himself adds to the tradition units in order to indicate the outline of larger passages. We can call these "expressions of outline".

One such expression of outline in Matt. 18 is εἷς τῶν μικρῶν τούτων. The first time we come across it is in v. 6 where the writer has taken it from Mark 9:42. After that he repeats it in the framework at the beginning (v. 10) and at the end (v. 14) of the parable of the lost sheep. In this way he indicates that vs. 6-14 belong together. Seeing that v. 5 is built up in a parallel way and factually constitutes an antithesis to v. 6, we can see that the evangelist has formed the whole section vs. 5-14 into a whole round the theme "care for the little ones".

In the same way, Matthew uses the word ἀδελφός in v. 15 (=Luke 17:3) as an expression of outline in the framework of section vs. 21-35. Seeing that ἀφίημι plays such in important part in this section we can put "brotherly forgiveness" as a title for vs. 15-35.

The clearest expression of outline in Matt. 18 is, however, οὐρανός. It appears 11 times in the chapter, [12] of which it appears 7 times in the editorial frameworks. The section vs. 1-4 is framed by (ὁ) μείζων ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν. The parable of the lost sheep (vs. 10-14) is framed by τὸ πρόσωπον (ἔμπροσθεν) τοῦ πατρός ... τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς. The parable of the unforgiving servant (vs. 23-35) is framed by ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν and ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος respectively. Also in v. 19, the phrase παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς is clearly the evangelist's own wording. On the other hand, the word is missing altogether in Matt. 17, while it appears four times in Matt. 19, of which three of the times can be explained from the synoptic parallels. [13]

This shows that the evangelist thought of Ch. 18 as a unified composition. Then obviously the first section (vs. 1-4) has an essential position. That structure which, according to these verses, prevails in heaven, and which, to put it simply, consists of the renunciation of every human hierarchy, should characterize the mutual relationships of the disciples. Care for the little ones and brotherly forgiveness are the

practical results of this fundamental attitude. The evangelist wants to show throughout the whole chapter that conditions in the earthly community thus corresponds to the conditions "in heaven", "in the kingdom of heaven", "with my heavenly Father",

Thus the key words in Matt. 18 imply the following outline:

Matt.18: The disciples' mutual relationships
1-4 Fundamental section: The order in the kingdom of heaven.
5-35 Practical section:
5-14 Care for the little ones
15-35 Brotherly forgiveness

The material the evangelist has used is in itself heterogeneous, but by being placed in this context it gets a more unified meaning. Thus v. 5, as far as we can see, earlier dealt with children in the literal sense. By being placed together with vs. 1-4 the verse here comes to talk of children in a transferred meaning, i.e. Christians, or possibly, a group of Christians. [14] The section 18:8-9 is used in Matt. 5:29-30 about seduction within an individual, But here the text instead speaks of the relationship to seductive people. [15] And the parable of the lost sheep (vs. 10-14) is used in Luke 15:4-7, probably more originally, as a polemic against the scribes and Pharisees. Here it becomes a parable about the disciples' relationships to their fellow brethren who have been led astray from the right path. [16]

To summarize: Matt. 18 constitutes a literary unit. The evangelist has inserted tradition material of different types and content into the composition. With this chapter he wants to show how the relationships amongst the disciples should be characterized by care for the little ones and brotherly forgiveness. In this way he presents the earthly community as a kind of counterpart to heaven.

There are three particular sections in the chapter which are of interest if one wants to find out what Matthew considered the limits of the community to be: Matt. 18:1-4, 8-9, 15-17.

b. Who is the Greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven? 18:1-4 [17]

Matthew has adapted a tradition which is also reproduced in Mark 9:33-37 and Luke 9:46-48. His adaptation seems to concern the following points.

v.1 Mark and Luke report the quarrel among the disciples as to who was the greatest. Matt. says nothing of the quarrel and instead allows the disciples to ask the question theoretically: who is the greatest? In this way he underlines the fundamental meaning of the text. It no longer just deals with a dramatic episode; the question is fundamental. [18] In Mark and Luke the question is formulated as indirect. Matt. formulates

a direct question. Thompson points out that the wording τίς ἄρα in Matt. usually takes up and intensifies an earlier presentation (Matt. 19:25, 27; 24:45). Thompson sees in this an argument for a logical connection between 17:24-27 and 18:1-4.[19] If τίς ἄρα is to be understood as hinting at something mentioned earlier, about which not all authors are agreed,[20] it seems more likely that the question refers back to the second prediction of the passion which in both Mark and Luke directly precedes this passage. Thus one can either interpret the disciples' question as: If now the Son of Man goes away, who of us is then to take his place? Or: If now the Son of Man's task is to die, of what does then "greatness" in the new community consist? It seems likely that Mark and Luke comprehended the question according to the first interpretation while Matt. preferred the second. That is why Matthew inserts the section about the temple tax (17:24-27), makes a new start in Matt. 18:1 (ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ) and omits the reporting of the dispute among the disciples.

After the question, Matthew inserts ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν (the same is the case after the answer in v. 4).[21] This addition emphasizes still more that for Matthew the question was wholly fundamental. It is not a matter of the incidental order of rank among the disciples, but of the basic structure in the kingdom of heaven. It has been debated whether it here is a matter of the present or the coming kingdom of God. Thompson refers to the usual use of the formula ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ (τῶν οὐρανῶν) and settles for the future alternative.[22] Trilling feels that neither of the alternatives apply. The evangelist has not thought along a horisontal timetable but along a vertical scheme. The disciples are asking about the inner order in God's dominion.[23] Seeing that the thought of the analogue between the earthly community and "heaven" runs throughout the chapter, it seems that Trilling's interpretation ought to be preferred. The structure of the coming kingdom of God is to apply already now among the disciples.

v. 2 According to Mark 9:35 Jesus called up the twelve. Matthew bypasses this item. For him the question is theoretical. He saves the words of Jesus until 23:11.

vs. 3-4 lack synoptic parallels but equivalents can be found (Mark 10:15; Luke 18:17) which Matthew could have used. As far as the content is concerned Matthew here expresses the same thing as the words of Jesus (Mark 9:35) which he leaves out. Traditional orders of rank do not apply in the kingdom of heaven.

Thus by Matthew's formulation of the tradition the disciples' question is liberated from incidental circumstances. The words of Jesus stand out as a carefully thought through manifesto of the basic structure of the kingdom of heaven and thus also of the church. Against the background of our earlier investigations the focus of the text comes out clearly. We have seen that the idea of a holy hierarchically ordered community

dominated the rules for expulsion in Qumran.[24] For a member of Qumran it was a holy duty to observe that rank which his knowledge and deeds entitled him to. One of the lists of people who for the sake of holiness had to be refused full communion also included minors.[25] Also in the rabbinic tradition do we find that questions of rank were of topical interest.[26] Concentration on the community's holiness and the novice process within the Pharisaic fellowships ought to have resulted in similar rules, even though they probably were not as strict as in Qumran.

In a situation like this, to lift up a child as an example must have been understood as a severe polemic against every thought of a community with a hierarchical structure. Matthew, with his adaptation, had underlined the range of the principle involved in the polemic. The question reappears in v. 10 in a way which is a direct reminder of the list in 4QD[b] with its motivations (see above p. 76). Precisely the angels of the little ones have the foremost place before the face of the Father.[27]

Similar polemics against a hierarchically constructed community appear often in the synoptic gospels. In Matt. 23:5-12 different manifestations of ambitions to rise in rank are lashed: to indicate one's greater piety by one's clothing, to want the foremost seats at meals and assemblies,[28] to use fine titles. As a summary Matthew uses the words of Jesus which Mark gives in connection with the disciples' quarrel about rank (Mark 9:35) "If anyone wants to be first, he must make himself last of all and servant of all". In Matt. 11:25 with par. Jesus thanks the Father that the revelation was given, not to the wise and learned,[29] but to the infants and the childishly uneducated.[30] On the whole Jesus' association with sinners and his healing of physical and spiritual defects can be seen as polemics against a community limit of the type which is expressed in the lists from Qumran.

The intention of placing a child foremost is thus, according to Matthew, not for the sake of pointing out a quality in the child which is particularly worth aspiring after. The assumption that it is the child's way of saying "Abba" to his father that the disciples were to copy is also beside the point.[31] The question as to who is greatest in the kingdom of heaven is a fundamental question about what kind of structure is to prevail in the new community. And the answer is just as fundamental. In the new community there is no place for hierarchical thinking. There the last shall be first and the least greatest.[32]

c. If Your Hand Causes You to Sin. 18:8-9

The question here is whether the "hand", "foot", "eye" are to be understood symbolically or literally. If one chooses to understand the words literally, there are two possible interpretations.

1. The subordinate clauses express the situation that parts of a

person's own body (hand, foot, eye) entice him (σε) to sin. The main clauses urges him rather to get rid of that part of his body which tempts him than to keep it and bring judgement upon himself. It should be pointed out that the type of sin is not specified. If this interpretation is preferred, the idea of sexual seduction naturally presents itself, but also other temptations are conceivable in this connection.[33]

2. The subordinate clauses express the situation that the parts of a person's body can cause another person to be led astray. The main clauses urge one rather to remove the part in question. Σκανδαλίζει σε then has to be seen as causative: "makes you a stumbling-block". In this case the sin is not specified either.[34]

3. One gets a third interpretation if one understands "hand", "foot", "eye" as symbolic. Then the subordinate clauses express the situation that a member in the community tries to cause someone (σε) to fall. The main clauses urge the one who was tempted to dissociate himself from the tempter.[35] Within this alternative, σε can be understood in different ways: as an individual or as a personification of the whole church.

Which of these interpretations is the most likely? In order to answer this question we will first compare the passage with its parallel passages. Compared with Mark 9:43-47, Matt. 18:8-9 shows the following distinctive features.

a) Mark 9:42 ("the man who is a cause of stumbling to one of these little ones" etc.) and Mark 9:43 do not seem to be logically connected but only to be put together according to the principle of hook-words. Mark 9:43 makes a marked new beginning: καὶ ἐὰν σκανδαλίσῃ.

Between the two statements by Jesus Matthew inserts 18:7 (woe to the seducers) and connects v. 8 with the previous: εἰ δὲ ἡ χείρ σου. Matthew seems to be concerned to give a more logical connection.

b) Mark 9:43, 45, 47 deals with seduction by means of the hand, the foot, the eye, one at a time. The passage is grouped into three strictly parallel parts. In Matthew the hand and the foot are dealt with together (v. 8). The passage has only two parts; the parallelism has gone.

c) Mark puts the verb of the subclauses into the subjunctive (eventual case). Matthew puts the verb of the subclauses in the indicative (objective case). The difference can imply that for Mark it is a question of a purely hypothetical discussion, whereas in Matthew the condition has to do with real problems in the community.

d) Mark adds on further words according to the principle of hook-words: v. 49 "for everyone will be salted with fire", v. 50 "if the salt loses its saltness". Matt. 18:10ff continues the theme of care for the little ones. Εἷς τῶν μικρῶν from v. 6 is repeated and marks the connection.

The comparison indicates that Matthew has imagined a logical

connection for the whole section 18:6-14. In comparison with Mark 9:43-47 Matt. 18:8-9 seems to be secondary.

Compared with Matt. 5:29-30, Matt. 18:8-9 shows the following distinctive features.

a) Matt. 5:29-30 is included in the section on adultery. The passage illustrates the requirement of being on one's guard against sexual temptations. Matt. 18:8-9, on the other hand is placed in a context which speaks of care for the little ones.

b) Matt. 5:29-30 mentions first seduction by means of the eye, then through the hand. Matt. 18:8-9 mentions first the hand and the foot, then the eye. The arrangement in Matt. 5 is well suited to its aim: above all the eye, even the hand, but hardly the foot can lead one into sexual temptation. The aim in Matt. 18 should in any case be another.

c) Matt. 5:29-30 mentions that it was a question of the right eye and the right hand. Thus he underlines how costly the sacrifice which is demanded can be. The words are understood literally. Matt. 18 has nothing corresponding to it.

The comparison shows that Matt. 5:29-30 is clearly adapted for a literal sexual interpretation. Seeing that Matt. 18:8-9 lack the features that would make this kind of interpretation natural, its meaning ought to be different.

With reference to the logical connection which Matthew takes pains over, interpretation 1 (parts of a person's body lead him into sin) is, on the whole, unlikely. The whole of Ch. 18 deals with the disciples' mutual relationships. Both immediately before as well as immediately after this passage, Matthew warns against seducing other people, the little ones.

Interpretation 2 (parts of a person's body can make him a stumbling-block for others) implies a causative use of σκανδαλίζω which is not otherwise borne out. It is most unlikely that Matthew should here use the words with a different linguistic function than in Matt. 5. The linguistic construction should be the same: σε is the object, not the subject, of the seduction.[36] Furthermore, it is a little difficult to imagine situations in which such a literal interpretation of the word would be adequate.

Interpretation 3 (a member of the church tries to cause someone to fall) fits best into the context. The difficulty with this interpretation lies in the fact that σε as an object for the seduction seems to imply an individual, while σου to whom the part of the body belongs seems to imply the whole community. But the inconsistency is explainable as being the result of the passage previously (Mark) having been used in a literal meaning. Now when used as a metaphor it is somewhat halting.

If, as it appears to me, interpretation 3 is the most likely, we have here in Matt. 18:8-9 a passage which advises the church to expel members who have committed a given offence. We shall see later that

there is only one other synoptic text where this is the case (Matt. 7:19). Otherwise the community, according to the synoptic gospels, is open. Certain people do not accept the kingdom of heaven and therefore they cannot enter the earthly community round Jesus either. But these people have themselves drawn the boundary between them and the church. Not even in Matt. 18:15-20 is it a clearly stated offence which leads to the ascertainment that a person stands outside the community. Only here, in Matt. 18:8-9 (and in Matt. 7:19) is a concrete specified reason for expulsion implied. He who causes others to fall, i.e. he who entices other members to deviate from the Christian faith and way of life, must be separated from the community for the sake of those that are small and weak.[37] It is actually to be expected that it is Matthew who gives this instruction seeing warnings for seduction, blind guides and false prophets constitute one of Matthew's special themes. In the last days false prophets will arise and mislead many (Matt. 24:10f). One must beware of false prophets and recognize them by their fruits (Matt. 7:15, 20). In the final judgement all seducers will receive their punishment (Matt. 13:41). The actual word σκάνδαλον appears in the gospels almost solely in Matt.[38] As the forms of the verbs in Matt. 18:8-9 suggest (indicative in the subclauses) it is a matter of real difficulties in the church which lie behind Matthew's use of the word "seduction". In his milieu the risk of apostasy was so evident, the situation of the little ones so exposed, that the principle of the openness of the community had to be modified.

d. If Your Brother Sins. 18:15-17

Construction and Terminology

Matt. 18:15-17 consists of five similarly constructed conditional complex sentences. The third sentence is expanded by a quotation from Deut. 19:15.[39] Ἀκοῦσῃ in the second and third sentence corresponds to παρακούσῃ in sentences four and five. In the first and last sentences ὁ ἀδελφός and ὁ ἐθνικὸς καὶ ὁ τελώνης denote two contrasts, the end points on the road away from the community. A certain symmetry thus characterizes the construction of the text. The style is that of the Old Testament's legal language.

The terminology is not particularly typical of Matthew. Ἁμαρτάνω is to be found in Matt. only in 18:15, 21 and 27:4.[40] Ἀδελφός in the sense of "neighbour" is a common Biblical word.[41] In Matt. ἐλέγχω is only to be found here.[42] These three terms seem to be inspired by Lev. 19:17, the basic passage about the duty of reproving.

Lev. 19:17 LXX:
οὐ μισήσεις τὸν ἀδελφόν σου τῇ διανοίᾳ σου,
ἐλεγμῷ ἐλέγξεις τὸν πλησίον σου
καὶ οὐ λήμψῃ δι'αὐτὸν ἁμαρτίαν.

Μεταξὺ σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ μόνου is possibly an Aramaism.[43] Ἀκούω in the sense of "obey" is found in Matt. only here and in 17:5 (allusion to Deut. 18:15 LXX). Κερδαίνω is used by Matthew in several places: 16:26 (=Mark 8:36; Luke 9:25); 18:15; 25:16, 17, 20, 22. But in the other passages the object is material gains. Here, on the other hand, the word seems to be used as a "mission term".[44] In the whole of the NT παρακούω appears only here, and - in a different meaning - in Mark 5:36.[45] Ἐκκλησία is only to be found here and in Matt. 16:18.

Ἐκκλησία in the LXX nearly always stands for קהל.[46] The term was presumably taken over by the Greek speaking Jewish Christians directly from the LXX.[47] As far as Matt. 16:18 and 18:17 are concerned, K. L. Schmidt assumes that the Aramaic כנישתא could be the underlying word.[48] But that also Matt. 18:15-17 was from the beginning worked out in Greek is evident from its dependence on Luke 17:3 and the LXX in v. 15f. The term ἡ ἐκκλησία in its definite form and absolute position implies the claim of constituting God's congregation (קהל) in the Old Testament meaning.[49] While in Matt. 16:18 the word seems to indicate a future Messianic church, it here describes an existing local community.

In Matt. 18:17, as in Matt. 5:46f, the words ἐθνικός and τελώνης have a pejorative tone. Both passages are hard to reconcile with Matthew's text about how pagans and toll-collectors receive the kingdom of God.[50] Here it assumes a purely Jewish community.

The construction and the terminology imply that Matt. 18:15-17 constitute a uniform tradition taken over by the evangelist.

Tradition of the Pericope

Luke 17:3 corresponds to Matt. 18:15. Luke 17:4 corresponds to Matt. 18:21f. Seeing both Matt. 18:15-17 and Luke 17:3-4 stylistically go together very well, it is difficult to determine the relationship between the passages.

It is generally considered that Luke 17:3f most closely corresponds to the common source and that Matthew transformed the tradition in accordance with material which he had received from a Jewish Christian source.[51] The fact that Luke's version is shorter and aims at a more special situation points towards this concept. Luke speaks of personal injustices (ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς σέ), while Matthew does not indicate what kinds of sins are intended.[52]

However, Luke's choice of words appears secondary in relation

to Matthew's. The terminology in Matt. 18:15 alludes to Lev. 19:17 (see above). Luke avoids the Semitic-sounding parataxis ὕπαγε ἔλεγξον and translates ἔλεγξον by the more common ἐπιτίμησον. In the same way it is natural to assume that Luke exchanges ἀκούω (meaning "obey") for μετανοέω which he was more used to.[53]

More or less on these grounds Thompson assumes that Luke as well as Matthew substantially transformed the tradition, and that Matthew in this common passage has better preserved the original wording.[54] But this does not solve all the problems. The situation remains, that also Matt. 18:16f shows features which are non-Matthean and that the whole rule, vs. 15-17, constitutes a harmonious unit which is stylistically different from its context. It therefore seems likeliest to assume that Matthew's version of the tradition, in an intermediary stage, was transformed into a rule for membership (vs. 15-17), which the evangelist took over in a completed form and joined on to vs. 18-20.[55]

Relation to Rabbinic Expulsion

According to P. Billerbeck's description of the Jewish practice of the ban, the rabbis differentiated between the "little ban" נדוי and the "great ban" חרם.[56] Each individual Jew had the right to speak the little ban. One had to be at least ten persons to speak the great ban. On the grounds of this concept R. Bohren maintained that Jesus, according to Matt. 18:15-17, polemized against the Jewish ban.[57] According to Jesus the individual had only the right to reprove. Only when together with a few witnesses was one allowed to lay the little ban, and only the community as a whole could lay the great ban.

We have, however, seen that Billerbeck does not take into consideration the development which the rabbinic ban underwent.[58] If one takes the chronology into account, it is evident that חרם as an intensified ban was not known before the third century A.D.

Neither can one, with Bohren, see reproving before witnesses as a form of punishment, a be it milder ban. Reproving was, as we have seen, a brotherly and loving admonition which was a part of the ordinary Jewish community ideal. It was conceived as something positive - not negative.

Finally, we have seen that the rabbinic ban took the form of a partial and temporary expulsion. The one who was banned was distanced from the community in certain respects, and he was considered as unclean for a period of 30 days. But, when the church in Matt. 18:17 declares the impenitent to be a pagan and a toll-collector, it is declaring that he no longer belongs to the community.[59] The expulsion is total. The rule, taken by itself, shows expulsion to be definite. Nothing indicates that the one expelled can return.

Bohren's hypothesis, that the words of Jesus in Matt. 18:15-17 take up and correct the rabbinic ban, has therefore to be dismissed. In all probability Matt. 18:15-17 regulates no ban procedure.

The passage can rather be equated with the rabbinic traditions about total expulsion from the Pharisaic fellowships. Tos Dem III 4 (49), which is reproduced above on p. 90, is of particular interest in this aspect. The rule that a tax-collector had to be definitely expelled from the Pharisaic fellowships reminds one of the information in Matt. 18:17 that an impenitent sinner should be treated as a toll-collector.

Now, tax-collector (גבאי) and toll-collector (מוכס , τελώνης) are not quite the same thing. The former collected only direct taxes, while the latter collected the indirect taxes like tolls and other duties. In NT times the former was an official employee, while the latter was a private business man who hired his right to collect toll. But in this connection one can hardly expect that the distinction was maintained consistently. According to the Talmud it was difficult for both groups to be converted.[60] It is hardly likely that a toll-collector had greater possibilities of becoming a member of the Pharisaic fellowship than did a tax-collector.

The expression "as the pagan and the toll-collector" thus indicates a community which drew up its limits in about the same way as the Pharisaic fellowships.

Relation to Qumran

The closest parallels to Matt. 18:15-17 are to be found - as many have pointed out[61] - in 1QS V 24 - VI 1 and CD IX 2-4. Also here the reproving is characterized by a brotherly tone. Also here there is laid down an expulsion procedure on different levels. H. Braun sees a specific analogy in this and maintains that Matt. 18:15-17 is dependent on Qumran.[62]

However, the fact that reproving was marked by brotherly love is not a thing which exclusively characterized the NT and Qumran.[63] The parallels between the different levels a sinner had to go through is not exact either. Matthew alone, and not Qumran, lays down that the reproving had to take place first of all in private. All that remains is that both Matthew and the Qumran texts demand reproving before witnesses before sentence can be passed.

This, however, has a certain counterpart in the rabbinic rules for legal procedures about the so-called forewarning.[64] If an accused was to be condemned, one had first to show that his criminal act was committed intentionally and with a knowledge of its import.[65] That is why the witnesses were questioned at the trial as to whether they had warned the accused. Only if they had done so without success could sentence be passed. The rabbinic tradition does not expressly decree

that such a forewarning had to take place privately and then be repeated by the witnesses together. But, seeing that both witnesses had to warn the guilty one the procedure must often have been the same. In other words, rabbinic parallels to Matt. 18 and the Qumran texts are missing, but a certain analogy can be seen in the forewarning.

Of what exactly does the similarity between the Qumran texts and Matt. 18:15-17 consist? It is to be found in the fact that both incorporated brotherly, loving reproving into the legal procedure. In the rabbinic documents Lev. 19:17 is never quoted as support for the duty of witnesses to warn.[66] One's duty to reprove his neighbour belonged, so to say, to the private sphere and had nothing to do with the legal procedure, the number of witnesses and their duty etc. But both Qumran and Matthew develop their rules for expulsion by combining Lev. 19:17 with Deut. 19:15 and in this way they let the private and the legal sphere melt into one.[67] Thus both give the witnesses a new task: They have to take part in the reproving and, if that fails, they have to give evidence of the sinner's disobedience.

In Matt. 18 there is no literary dependence on Qumran. The same Old Testament texts are used, but in rather different ways. 1QS V 24 - VI 1 builds mostly on Lev. 19:17 but also alludes to Deut. 19:15. In the following passage allusions to Lev. 19:17 are underlined once and allusions to Deut. 19:15 twice. For the reconstruction of the passage see Ch. II, note 50.

> One shall reprove[68] each man his neighbour[69] with truth and humility and affectionate love[70] towards each man. One must not speak to him in anger or with a grudge or with a stiff neck or with the zeal of an evil spirit. And one must not hate[71] him--- of one's heart.[72] fore one must reprove[73] him on the (same) day, so that one does not draw guilt over oneself.[74] And one must not take up a case[75] against one's neighbour before the Many if it has not been preceded by reproof[76] before witnesses.[77]

Also CD IX implies a combination of both texts but mentions neither of them.[78] Matt. 18:15-17 alludes to Lev. 19:17 LXX in v. 15 and quotes Deut. 19:15 LXX in v. 16. But even if no literary dependence is to be found it is clear that factually Matt. 18:15-17 must have been influenced by either Qumran or some other similar community.

Matt. 18:15-17 without its Context

Here I summarize the results thus far. Separated from its context vs. 15-17 constitue a halakic rule for how one is to behave towards a fellow-believer who deviates from the norms of the community.[79] The rule has

come into being on the basis of a tradition which in a more original form is reproduced in Luke 17:3. It has developed by means of a combination of Lev. 19:17 and Deut. 19:15, a procedure which has close parallels in Qumran. The rule has obviously been drawn up in a local Greek-speaking Christian community with only Jewish members. It is clear that the rule does not originate from the historical Jesus. The situation does not fit into the life of Jesus, and the words do not fit into his mouth. The rule has been taken over by Matthew in its finished form.

According to this rule one is first to reprove the deviator privately, i.e. one admonishes him and tries to make him see his guilt and amend. If this fails, one takes along one or two witnesses. These are partly to reinforce the reproving, partly - if the reproving fails - to give evidence of the disobedience before the community. The latter makes a new attempt to win back the one who has fallen. If this does not work, all associations with the sinner are broken off. Admittedly this takes place on the personal level (ἔστω σοι) but the legal style of the passage and the quotation from Deut. 19:15 show that it was understood as a juridical act. The one who has fallen away now is declared to be definitely outside the limits of the community. There is nothing to indicate that he can be received back again.

No theological motif is connected with the expulsion. Above all, there is no trace of zeal to expel those that are unclean, for the sake of the community.[80] There is an air of voluntariness about the whole procedure. The community is only confirming the apostasy which has already taken place earlier when the sinner did not want to "listen".

Matt. 18:15-17 in its Matthean Context

Thus, the evangelist has taken this rule in its finished state. But how has he used it? Has he, by inserting it into his composition, changed its meaning?

Already the words "a pagan and a toll-collector" get, when inserted into Matt. as a whole, a different tone than when the rule is taken by itself. Admittedly, the words appear even in Matt. with a marked pejorative meaning. Pagans and toll-collectors are bad examples on the question of love (5:46f), pagans babble when they pray (6:7). Toll-collectors stand on the same level as sinners (9:10f) and prostitutes (21:31f). But, in both the last-named passages, the toll-collector, though despised by men, stands in God's sight in preference to the Pharisees. And, throughout the whole of Matt. it is emphasized that also the Gentiles (τὰ ἔθνη) are to hear the gospel and become disciples (4:15; 12:21; 28:19).[81] In the rule of 18:15-17, taken by itself, the pagan and the toll-collector are evidently and definitely outside the community. Even in the Matthean context they are outside the community, but they also constitute objects of

God's particular care[82] and have the possibility of entering the community again.

But the rule's immediate context is more important. We will go through the surrounding texts in order, so as to see how they each in their own way modify Matt. 18:15-17.[83]

In certain respects the parable of the lost sheep, Matt. 18:10-14, and the rule about the brother who sins, vs. 15-17, show a common pattern.[84] As Matthew reproduces the parable, it is to illustrate the right relationship to "one of these little ones" (vs. 10, 14). On the level of imagery he is portrayed as a sheep which has been led astray (πλανηθῇ).[85] Then the shepherd goes and looks for the sheep. If it is found again, he rejoices. Apparently the result is not obvious, but it is stressed in the framework of the parable that such attempts at rescue are in accordance with the will of the Father. The situation is similar in the rule which follows it. A brother, i.e. a fellow believer, has sinned and thus deviated from the right path. A series of measures now have to be taken. If they succeed, the brother is won back; but there is a risk that the measures will fail. When the rule is taken by itself the stress lies on the expulsion. But, by placing the rule after the parable the evangelist underlines the fact that one has to attempt to lead the brother back. The stress no longer lies on the expulsion but on the attempt at rescue.

In Matt. 18:18 the evangelist repeats the words about binding and loosing which he has already given in 16:19. What do the terms δέω and λύω signify? The Semitic equivalents, Hebrew אסר and חחיר, Aramaic אסר and שרא are used in the rabbinic literature usually in the sense of "declare as forbidden" and "declare as permitted", "burden with an obligation" and "lift an obligation".[86] This meaning could conceivably be used for Matt. 16:19, but not for Matt. 18:18 where the word is used for giving heavenly authority to the judgements passed by the community. Billerbeck, Büchsel and others, instead settle for the meaning "lay a ban" and "raise a ban". However, this use of the words is found only once in rabbinic literature.[87] Furthermore, we have seen that Matt. 18:15-17 cannot be equated to the Jewish ban. It is therefore more reasonable to proceed from a more general meaning of the two concepts. Originally the binding and the loosing described the judge's authority.[88] The general meaning "pronounce sentence" and "verdict of acquittal" respectively, would fit both Matt. 16:19 and 18:18. This comprehensive authority can be made tangible in various ways. In Matt. 16:19 the interest is above all associated with the authority to make decisions on doctrine. The terms are used in the same way in the rabbinic literature. Matt. 23:13 constitutes a New Testament parallel where the scribes presumed to claim the keys of the kingdom of heaven.[89] In John 20:23 we find the words for loosing and binding transformed into authority to forgive sins or to refuse to forgive, respectively. Finally in Matt. 18:18 we find the authority made tangible in a third way. Here is a reference to

the power to declare a person as having forfeited his membership or to receive a person back into fellowship.[90] But at the same time as the words "bind" and "loose" can be used in this way in various concrete situations, the underlying and more general meaning should be able to remain. All are different aspects of the same binding and loosing, of the same authority.[91]

Matt. 18:18 is an integral part of the general theme about "the heavenly counterpart" (see above p. 118f). But it is evident that the connection between "heaven" and the earthly community here (and in v. 19f) is of a different kind than in the rest of the chapter. Here the community is not only responsible for creating the anti-hierarchical structure of the kingdom of heaven or to carry out "the heavenly Father's will". The community is seen as invested with the heavenly authority. It has now already a part in the eschatological kingdom.[92]

Still, the kingdom of God is not identified with the earthly community. Whatever the community binds or looses shall be (ἔσται) respectively bound or loosed in heaven. The decision is to be ratified by God.

When separated from its context Matt. 18:15-17 lays no stress on the community's authority. By adding on the words giving authority, the evangelist brings it out and gives the rule a pronounced sacral dimension.

The following verses, 18:19f, further specify the eschatological authority which is entrusted to the community. It is tempting to see in the two who pray or the two or three who are gathered in Jesus' name, the witnesses mentioned in v. 16.[93] When isolated, the words had a different significance.[94] But here they seem to describe how the community is to exercise its authority in the very situation which vs. 15-17 deal with. The two or three who have tried to win back the one who has fallen are to gather in Jesus' name, with the community. They are to call upon God that the sinner may again be grafted into the community or else thrust out. And they can be assured that the living Lord is present and that their prayers are effective.[95]

In 18:21 the evangelist repeats the word "brother" as an expression of outline and in this way he points out that the following section is linked together with the previous one. Thus 18:21-35 form a counterpart to vs. 15-17. The rule in vs. 15-17 deal with the case in which the sinner refuses to listen and repent, and is disobedient. On the other hand, vs. 21-35 deal with the case in which the sinner repents and asks for forgiveness. The instruction is completely clear: One's duty to forgive is unlimited (v. 21f). When the rule in vs. 15-17 is taken by itself expulsion appears to be definite. But Matt. 18:21f expressly contradicts the thought that forgiveness should be withheld after a certain number of transgressions. According to the evangelist expulsion was only to be temporary.[96]

The concluding parable about the unforgiving fellow-servant (vs. 23-35) gives still another shade of meaning to the rule in vs. 15-17.

According to the parable the forgiveness of God and the forgiveness of men are interwoven. That the disciples live in mutual forgiveness is a condition for their receiving the forgiveness of God. The same thought is found in Matthew's version of the Lord's prayer (6:12) and in his postscript to the prayer (6:14f).[97] Placed in its context the parable serves to underline that which was most important in the disciples' mutual relationships and in this way gives the rule a definite emphasis. It is mercy, the desire for reconciliation and reunion, which is important. As a "heavenly" community, the church is to be marked by brotherly reproving and mutual forgiveness. The church is the place of forgiveness. But with this, the seriousness of the apostate's position comes out. He who will not listen to the reprovings, and therefore has to be considered as a pagan and a toll-collector, has not only placed himself outside a human community. He has also left the area of God's forgiveness.

Finally it can be mentioned that the evangelist, by means of his redaction, somewhat alters the picture which the rule gives of the practical mode of procedure. When the rule is taken by itself the community as a whole has the final and decisive word. Neither the expulsions nor the reprovings are carried out by specific officials. But Matt. 18 in its entirety is directed at the "disciples", i.e. the twelve (v. 1) and to Peter (v. 21f) respectively, and the words about responsibility for the little ones and the parable of the lost sheep imply that it is the leaders of the church who are being instructed. The context makes it likely that during the time of the evangelist it was the task of those holding office to reprove and expel.[98]

2. 2 Thess. 3:6-15

a. Connection with 1 Thess.

The section appears to be loosely hung on, inserted in the middle of a concluding wish.[99] There are practically no connections with the rest of 2 Thess. On the other hand, thoughts and formulations from 1 Thess. are used:

1 Thess. 5:14[100]	2 Thess. 3:6
παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς	παραγγέλλομεν δὲ ὑμῖν
ἀδελφοί	ἀδελφοί ...
νουθετεῖτε	στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς
	ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ
τοὺς ἀτάκτους	ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντος

2:9	3:7f
μνημονεύετε γάρ ἀδελφοί	αὐτοὶ γάρ οἴδατε ...
τὸν κόπον ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν μόχθον	ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ
νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐργαζόμενοι	νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐργαζόμενοι
πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαί τινα ὑμῶν	πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαί τινα ὑμῶν
4:10f	**3:12**
παρακαλοῦμεν ...	παραγγέλλομεν καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν ...
ἡσυχάζειν καὶ ...	μετὰ ἡσυχίας
ἐργάζεσθαι ...	ἐργαζόμενοι
παρηγγείλαμεν	...

These repetitions, among other things, have given rise to the theory that 2 Thess. is a pseudonymous letter. The letter was to make use of stylistic similarities with 1 Thess. but at the same time to proclaim a different eschatology, alleging that 1 Thess. was false (2 Thess. 2:2).[101]

But perhaps the repetitions in this very section fill a definite function. We have seen that, according to the general Jewish tradition, brotherly reproving constituted a religious duty, and that, according to the Qumran texts and Matt., this kind of reproving formed a part of the formal expulsion procedure. Is it conceivable that Paul here intentionally repeats the admonitions in order to make a more formal procedure possible?

2 Cor. 13:1-2 can throw a certain amount of light on the question. Here Paul refers to Deut. 19:15, the words about the witnesses which are also quoted in Matt. 18:16 and 1 Tim. 5:19. It could be thought that Paul here betrays knowledge of that tradition which Matt. 18:16 quotes.[102] 2 Cor. and Matt. 18 both deviate from the LXX B because ἐπὶ στόματος ... μαρτύρων is not repeated in the second part of the quotation. But this short version is also to be found in LXX Lucian, and it is possible that this lies behind both the quotations. Therefore, K. Stendahl rejects the idea of a direct dependence between Matt. 18 and 2 Cor. 13.[103] It is more worthwhile to compare 2 Cor. 13 with the Damascus Document. As we have seen earlier, CD IX 16-23, with reference to Deut. 19:15 (and 17:6) gives instruction as to how reproving witnesses from different occasions can be united so that sentence can be passed.[104] In 2 Cor. 13:1 Paul in the same way speaks about the repeated occasions on which he had

reproved the Corinthians and describes these occasions as witnesses which can be united to make judgement possible. The parallels are striking. Both Paul and CD interpret Deut. 19:15 so as to make testimonies from different occasions able to be united in order to make judgement possible, even though there is only one witness from each occasion of offence.[105]

Of course the situation in 2 Cor. 13 differs from that of CD IX. With Paul it is a question of general admonitions to the community, or to a group within the community, while in CD the rule applies to the transgression of a single individual. But even if Paul does not see his admonitions as juridically necessary prerequisites for expulsion, it is - according to my mind - clear, that he refers to the rule about repetition of reprovings (cf. also Gal. 1:9). If that is the case, the repetitions in 2 Thess. 3 are only what one would expect. Already when Paul was with the Thessalonians he admonished them to live industrious lives (1 Thess. 4:11; 2 Thess. 3:10). He did it yet again in 1 Thess. 4:11f, and now a third time in 2 Thess. 3:6-15. Logically, Paul points out that if none of these reprovings help, the community has to take formal measures.

b. Withdraw Yourselves from "the Undisciplined"! 3:6

Paul begins by solemnly urging the community to take certain measures against those who walk "in an undisciplined way". The order is given in "the name of (our) Lord Jesus Christ", which wording Paul makes use of in a similar connection in 1 Cor. 5:4. Against whom were these measures directed? Of what did they consist?

In the NT ἄταχτος (ἀτάχτως, ἀταχτέω) appears only in 1 Thess. 5:14 and 2 Thess. 3:6, 7, 11.[106] In classical Greek the words are used to denote soldiers who deviate from the regulations and discipline, but also more generally, to denote an undisciplined life. In the later Greek, the ethical meaning is common. Now, the verb is used in a couple of papyri about lack of discipline in work. This applies partly to a contract of employment from the year 66 A.D. in which a father binds himself to work for the number of days during which his son has been undisciplined. The other instance is a similar document from about 185 A.D. in which a weaver apprentice is granted 20 free days. If he exceeds this time by being idle (ἀργήσῃ), ill (ἀσθενήσῃ), or undisciplined (ἀταχτήσῃ), he has to repay it by means of work without pay.[107] Milligan and Dibelius assume that ἀταχτέω here has the meaning of "play the truant", "be idle", "fail to attend", and they think that this special meaning is also appropriate in 2 Thess. But, in the above examples the word can just as easily mean "be undisciplined", "neglect one's duty". In the second example it is hardly likely that ἀταχτήσῃ has the same meaning as ἀργήσῃ . In any case, the verb denotes lack of discipline rather than laziness.[108] In 1 Thess. 5:14 there is nothing to indicate

that the adjective ἄταχτος denotes lazy people. It is clear from the context that the undisciplined ones did not work. But Paul criticizes them not only for withdrawing from their duties but also for occupying themselves with such as does not concern them. B. Rigaux therefore supports the more general meaning, "undisciplined" ("in an undisciplined way", "lead an undisciplined life").[109]

The question is, however, do the words imply only ordinary civil lack of discipline? Paul's own definition in v. 6 leads one's thoughts in a different direction. He reproaches "the undisciplined" for not walking "according to the tradition you received from us".[110] It is evident that their lack of discipline did not merely consist in putting oneself up against civil propriety, but above all it implied that one had left the tradition as given by Paul. The content of this tradition ought to be the very rule formulated in v. 10: "The man who will not work shall not eat".

Paul now exhorts the community to "hold aloof from", στέλλεσθαι , these undisciplined people. Once again we come across a word which is unusual for the NT (only found here and in 2 Cor. 8:20). In the active, the word has the basic meaning of "set", "place", then "send", and further, "bring together", "make ready", and finally "restrain", "check", in the middle voice "draw back (from)" (Malachi 2:5).[111] More usual in the NT is the word ὑποστέλλω with a similar meaning, "draw back (oneself)", "avoid" (Acts 20:20, 27; Hebr. 10:38). Gal. 2:12 is interesting in this connection, as ὑποστέλλω here seems to have the meaning of "avoid sharing meals with". Seeing that Paul does not want to deny the undisciplined ones the name of "brother" (v. 15), it is not a question of complete expulsion from the community. Presumably it is this fellowship at meals which is implied (see below p. 138). "Hold aloof from (participating in meals with) those who walk in an undisciplined manner."[112]

c. Paul's Example and Instruction. 3:7-10

Paul continues by motivating his exhortation. First he refers to his own example: He did not behave himself in an undisciplined manner while he was with the Thessalonians. When Paul describes his own behaviour we get, so to say, a negative picture of the behaviour of the undisciplined ones:

a) He never ate anyone's bread without paying for it (cf. 2 Cor. 11:7).
b) He worked with toil and pains (cf. 2 Cor. 11:27; 1 Thess. 2:9),
c) in order not to be a burden to any of the Thessalonians (cf. 1 Thess. 2:9).
d) He certainly had a right to this (cf. 1 Cor. 9:4, 6, 12, 18),
e) but he wanted to give them an example to follow.

As in 1 Cor. 9; 2 Cor. 11 and 1 Thess. 2, Paul takes up the right he has (ἐξουσία) "in the gospel" (1 Cor. 9:18) to get free board and lodging in the communities.[113] As far as Paul is concerned, he did not himself take advantage of this right which, according to 2 Cor. 11, was considered by some as a sign of weakness.[114] It is evident that the undisciplined ones behaved in the opposite way: They had no right to free keep, but had still come to be a burden to the community.

So Paul repeats the ethical rule he had earlier passed on to the Thessalonians (v. 6): "The man who will not work shall not eat". We find similar maxims in both Jewish and pagan milieus (see commentaries ad loc.). Naturally the words can be utilized in widely differing ways;[115] as a justification for a capitalist employer's politics or as an attack against those living on interest.[116] In themselves the words do not say much about "the undisciplined".

d. Work Quietly. 3:11-12

After having reminded his readers of his example and his teaching Paul returns to the undisciplined ones. He has heard that some (τινας) live undisciplined lives, not working for their living (μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους) but being busy with other things (περιεργαζομένους). The wording does not give the impression that they were many. If the community had been able to give them free board and lodging they must have been few. Nor does Paul expect that more than a few (τις, v. 14) would continue to be undisciplined.

Περιεργάζομαι is translated by W. Bauer as "etw. Unnützes tun", "überflüssige Betriebsamkeit entwickeln", "sich unnütz machen". However, the word seems to contain more the idea that one meddles in that which does not concern one than that one is occupied with useless things.[117]

Paul exhorts these undisciplined ones to eat their own bread in peace and quiet. Their present mode of life is evidently not characterized by peaceful idleness. The exhortation is solemnly spoken "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ".

We are now back to the question as to who these undisciplined ones were. It is traditionally stated that the exaggeratedly tense parousia expectation resulted in a disinclination to work. Why should one work for earthly possessions when the time of the end was imminent? More important than gainful employment would then be to prepare oneself by means of prayer and contemplation.[118] It should, however, be noted that Paul himself never makes this connection between the parousia expectation and the lack of discipline. The reason for their refusal to work is not mentioned. Other possibilities are therefore open. It is, for example, conceivable that the undisciplined ones preached a message

which conflicted with Paul's, and that, as preachers, they claimed the right to food and lodging.[119] One would then, however, have expected Paul to directly polemize their teaching.

For our purpose it is not necessary to choose one interpretation or another. It is, in any case, clear that the offence of those that were undisciplined did not consist only in laziness or in offences against civil ethics of work. That which was important was the actual opposition to the regulations Paul had imposed.

e. Measures to be Taken by the Church. 3:13-15

Paul has stated the main rule: hold aloof from the undisciplined ones (v. 6). He has referred to his own example and to the commands he had given earlier (vs. 7-10). Now he once again turns to the community as a whole. What does this main regulation mean for them?

First of all, it means that the community has to do well in every situation (v. 13). Ἐγκακέω is an unusual word in the NT.[120] Καλοποιέω is hapaxlegomenon. There is, however, an obvious parallel in Gal. 6:9 which guarantees the meaning of both the words: "Never tire of doing good". There are different suggestions as to what this in actual fact means.[121] From the context it is reasonable to assume that the exhortation applies to the community's relationship to those that are undisciplined. Particularly, in the case of a person leaving his undisciplined life does the community have to show lenience. The conduct is about the same as in Matt. 18. Christians must always be prepared to forgive.

But, continues Paul, "if anyone disobeys our instructions given by letter, σημειοῦσθε him that no-one mingles with him so that he is ashamed. Do not consider him as an enemy but reprove him as a brother."

In the active σημειόω means "mark", "seal", "give a signal" and in the middle voice "mark for oneself", "note down", "take notice of" etc.[122] As a designation for a written statement we come across the word in, for example, a document from 137 A.D.: ὁ κράτιστος ἐσημειώσατο ἐν τῇ πρὸς Βάρβαρον ἐπιστολῇ.[123] G.W.H. Lampe states that as far as the patristic literature is concerned, the meaning is (in the middle voice) "record", "note down", "point out in writing", "signify in writing", as well as the more general meaning of "take note of".[124] We can take 1 Clem 43:1 as an example: Μωϋσῆς τὰ διατεταγμένα αὐτῷ πάντα ἐσημειώσατο ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις. In the papyri σημειοῦμαι is the usual word for "sign". Thus the word usually indicates an act of writing. Then there is hardly any reason for understanding the word in its transferred meaning "take note of", as do the majority of the commentators. Here the word certainly has its literal meaning. Paul exhorts the community to write down the names of those

persons who do not comply with his instructions. Also M. Dibelius assumes the meaning "note down" and suggests that the words imply a written announcement before the community of the person who is undisciplined.[125] Now, we have seen above (p. 49) that, according to CD IX 18 the Overseer was to write down with his own hand the name of the one who was reproved "against the time that he might do it again". In the light of this passage it is more likely that σημειοῦσθε implies the keeping of a protocol which could be referred to in the future if the undisciplined life continued and the punishment had to be made harsher. If this is the case we have here an example of a practical measure in connection with expulsion which the primitive church took over from the world around.

The Damascus Document can also contribute to one's understanding as far as the sanctions are concerned. According to CD IX 18, the one who defies the reproving was shut off from "the Purity". Paul writes: μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι .[126] Seeing that the sinner was still to be treated kindly and admonished as a brother, Paul cannot mean that he was to be totally separated from the community. The term clearly has a more specific meaning, but what is it? In several places in the Qumran texts (1QS VI 17, 22; VII 24; VIII 23; IX 8; CD XI 4) we come across a corresponding term ערב, which signifies entering into a relationship which is important from the point of view of purity. Thus the novice was allowed to "mix" his economy with that of the sect only when he came to the end of his novitiate.[127] He who entered into relationships on the question of "the Purity" or the economy with one who was thrust out must himself be expelled. Even to confer with someone was a relationship which had consequences for the purity and it was thus a relationship which one could enter into only with those that were pure or holy. In the NT the word συναναμείγνυμι is found in only one other passage, 1 Cor. 5:9, 11, in which the Corinthians are exhorted to avoid fornicators etc.[128] There Paul specifies matters in a way analogous to Qumran. Not every association is forbidden. It is above all fellowship at meals. As was the case in Qumran, Paul's church discipline also included the cutting off of relationships which from the point of view of purity were particularly sensitive. The offender is to be noted down and isolated - not from every social contact, but from such relationships as can contaminate those that are pure.

Finally, Paul's instruction that, even after an expulsion, one should continue to admonish the deviator, also has a striking counterpart in CD XX 4. Also there was the one expelled still to be reproved until he again stood in the holy communion.[129] Against this rule we can contrast 1QS IX 16f where it, however, is a question of people who stand completely outside the community.

Thus we find clear counterparts in the Qumran texts, particularly in the Damascus Document, to Paul's instructions to the church in

Thessalonica as to what measures to take against those that are undisciplined. Even the very concentration on obedience to a fixed regulation reminds one of the central role which the holy regulations had in the Manual of Discipline. But a direct dependence is not assured just by this. It is more likely that Paul refers to a practice which was commonly followed by the Jewish religious groups during the time of the New Testament.

3. 1 Cor. 5

a. Context

The connection between 1 Cor. 5 and the chapters that come before and after it is not very clear.[130] What is clear is that in Ch. 5, as in the surrounding chapters, Paul is above all interested in putting right the evils in the community. His ambition is not to elucidate general questions of dogma. Nor is it the individual sinner Paul is addressing - not even in vs. 1-5. He criticizes the community as a whole, in Chs. 1-4 for its schisms and supposed wisdom; in Chs. 5-6 for having allowed fornication within its ranks.[131]

Some formulations connect particularly Chs. 1-4 with Chs. 5-6 and show that for Paul the question throughout was to put right the various manifestations of the same disguised attitude in the community.

In 6:19 Paul repels the fornication by referring to the fact that the Christian's body is the temple of the Holy Spirit. He uses the same motivation for repelling party-mindedness in 3:16. A clear difference does exist. In 3:16 it is the community as a whole which is thought of as being God's temple and the dwelling-place of the Spirit. In 6:19 the Spirit of God lives in the body of each individual Christian. But the community has still broken the same law in either case. The community and its members are holy because God's Spirit lives there.

In 5:2 the community is criticized for not driving out the sinner from their midst when they were grieved by the case of fornication. By this the Corinthians have shown themselves to be "puffed up". This expression is to be found in several passages in 1 Cor. as a characteristic of the self-righteousness of the adversaries.[132] In Ch. 4 it is the formation of cliques and the empty verbosity of people who are "puffed up" which Paul attacks. In Ch. 8 and 13 being "puffed up" is described as an effect of too much gnosis and too little love. Here in Ch. 5 it is another aspect of the same thing which Paul turns against. The Corinthians have winked at the fornicator, and they have not been grieved by his behaviour. It is easy to assume that even the fornicator belonged to these "puffed up" and that his offence was connected with the opinions of this group and therefore could be defended.

Another term which connects Ch. 5 with the previous Chs. is "boast". Paul means to say that his opponents in Corinth "boast" when they hold fast to human wisdom. God, on the other hand, had chosen the foolish, the weak and the despised "so that no man might boast" (1:29). No-one should make men a cause of their boasting (3:21). He who boasts of his teacher, boasts of what he has received (4:7). Also the bad conditions that Paul wants to put right in Ch. 5 are manifestations of this self-commendation (v. 6).

The terminology shows that it is the same basic fault within the Corinthian community which Paul objects to in Chs. 1-4 and in Chs. 5-6, It is only the manifestations which vary.

This explains Paul's strong reaction in 1 Cor. 5. The apostle often admonishes the communities to be on their guard against fornication (1 Thess, 4:3; 2 Cor. 12:21; Gal. 5:19; Eph. 5:3; Col. 3:5) and maintains that those who commit fornication will not inherit the kingdom of God (Gal. 5:21; Eph. 5:5; 1 Cor. 6:9f). But these admonitions imply that tendencies to fornication did exist without the guilty ones being immediately weeded out. They remained in the community, but were admonished to improve. But here, on the contrary, we find Paul indignant that the fornicator was not driven out. The reason for this must be: In Corinth fornication was no isolated occurrence, no temporary affair, which could be repented of, confessed and forgiven within the community (cf. 2 Cor. 12:21). It was a situation which had lasted a long time (ἔχειν , v. 1), which had been accepted by those concerned and tolerated by the community itself. Seeing that the fornication was intentional and ostentatious and was a part of an attitude which threatened the very being of the community, Paul has to intervene with such force.

Thus 1 Cor. 5 is well connected with the surrounding chapters. But on the other hand, the chapter also constitutes a special unit which is dominated by the thought of the expulsion of fornicators from the community. The chapter seems to be framed by exhortations to drive out the one who is evil. V. 2: ἵνα ἀρθῇ ἐκ μέσου ὑμῶν ὁ τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο πράξας ; v. 13: ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν.[133] Paul begins by taking up the concrete case of the fornicator (vs. 1-2). After having given instructions to the community as to what measures should be taken (vs. 3-5), the apostle gives his theological motivation for the proceedings (vs. 6-8). With reference to his earlier instruction he therefore draws conclusions about how the community must separate itself from fornicators in general, and from other people who have transgressed grossly (vs. 9-13). Thus a certain symmetry characterizes the construction, of which vs. 6-8 form the centre of the chapter.

b. The Introduction. 5:1-2

What had the man done? He had evidently had an established sexual relationship with his stepmother. The father had presumably died or perhaps been separated from his wife. Both the OT and Roman law forbade such a relationship.[134] Now the Old Testament prohibition did not apply to proselytes, according to the rabbinic viewpoint, because at his conversion the proselyte cut off all bands with the past.[135] He was considered as fatherless and was therefore regarded as having no relatives on his father's side. H. Odeberg therefore says that the case could be allowed to pass from the Jewish point of view, but that Paul, on becoming a Christian had taken upon himself a stricter sexual morality.[136] But Paul can find no extenuating circumstances. Not even among pagans ha says, does this sort of thing happen, implying: far less then among Jews and Christians.[137]

This strengthens the impression that this case of fornication was but a part of a more profound error within the community. That is why Paul first and foremost criticizes the community who has tolerated the situation and not expelled the fornicator rather than the guilty one himself.

c. Expulsion of the Fornicator. 5:3-5

The construction of v. 4 is debated.

ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ can be traced to:

a) κέκρικα (Schlatter)
b) συναχθέντων ὑμῶν (Lietzmann, Odeberg)
c) παραδοῦναι (Robertson-Plummer, Conzelmann)

σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ can be traced to:

d) συναχθέντων ὑμῶν (Lietzmann, Odeberg)
e) παραδοῦναι (Heinrici, Lightfoot).

a) appears unlikely because of the intervening texts. The combinations of bd) and ce) are not particularly good either, seeing that both the prepositional phrases should be closer to each other if they were referring to the same word. There remains then be) and cd).

The choice between these two combinations is difficult. Let us first weight d) against e) and then b) against c).

d) against e)

That the preposition with which a verb is compounded, is repeated in the sentence is nothing unusual in the New Testament usage.[138] Admittedly, in the question of σὺν it is borne out in the NT only in Col. 2:13, but the actual construction σὺν + συνάγεσθαι is found in Micah 2:12.

Thus, linguistically, d) is quite possible. Also from the point of view of content, d) fits well. Power (the power of God, Eph. 1:19; 3:20; the power of the Holy Spirit, Rom. 15:13; power from on high, Luke 24:49) is something characteristic for the life of the community. It would be natural for Paul to exhort the Corinthians to come together in the power of our Lord Jesus.

For e) a pagan devotion formula is usually brought forward, in which σύν, according to A. Deissmann is used in the sense of "in fellowship with": δήσω ἐγὼ κείνην ... σὺν θ'Ἑκάτ[η]ι χθονίαι καὶ Ἐρινύσιν,[139] "I shall bind her.... in fellowship with Hekate of the underworld and the Erinyes". Seeing that παραδοῦναι without doubt describes a powerful charismatic action σὺν τῇ δυνάμει admittedly fit in to the context well as far as content is concerned.

A definite decision cannot be made in this case.

b) against c)

The formulation ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι is used throughout the LXX and the NT in the sense of "with mention of the name", "while calling on the name".[140] The combination with παραδοῦναι (c) corresponds best to the usual usage of the phrase. In the LXX we come across ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι (or corresponding expressions) about 25 times with verbs which designate liturgical acts such as blessing, cursing (2 Kings 2:24), invoking, praying, etc. but never in connection with expressions which mean "come together for worship" or something similar. Likewise, the formulation is common in the NT together with verbs which denote actions of charismatic and sacral character: drive out spirits, perform miracles, preach, baptize, anoint with oil etc.[141] 2 Thess. 3:6 weighs particularly heavily - here the formulation lays down a disciplinary measure: "I order you, brethren, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ". All this then speaks on behalf of c).

Only one single, difficult to judge argument speaks on behalf of b). In Matt. 18:20, immediately after the rule of expulsion, we find the formula συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα. Now, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα can be used parallel with ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι (and ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, Acts 2:38) e.g. with βαπτίζειν.[142] If the tradition of Matt. 18:15-20 was already formulated in Paul's time, and Paul had received it, then it is likely that it is this he is making use of, and that ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι can be drawn to συναχθέντων ὑμῶν (b).[143] But is this possible? We have seen above that Matt. 18:15-17 was presumably connected with vs. 18-20 at a late stage in the tradition.[144]

Nothing definite can be said here either, But whichever of the alternatives is the right one, the text expresses the spiritual, charismatic character of the proceedings with the fornicator. It is the community as a whole, in this case including Paul, which passes sentence and puts it into effect.[145] The community has come together with the power of Jesus (or in the name of Jesus), and the expulsion takes place in the name of Jesus

(or with the power of Jesus). The judgement is not just an earthly concern. The living Lord takes part in it and confers the heavenly authority.

It is particularly hard to define the character of the punishment. What is implied by the man being consigned to Satan? What do the spirit and the flesh signify? And, in this context what do the destruction of the body and the salvation of the spirit mean?

Deliver this man to Satan
(παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ σατανᾷ)

As the closest parallels to 1 Cor. 5:5 the antique pagan curse formulas are usually brought forward. A. Deissmann refers to a papyrus from the fourth century: "Death's demon, whoever you are, I hand over to you (παραδίδωμί σοι) such and such a person, in order that he shall not commit this or that deed".[146] H. Conzelmann mentions another text almost equally old: "Go out, demon, for I shall bind you with unbreakable fetters of steel, and I give you over (παραδίδωμί σε) to the black chaos in perdition".[147] It appears that the latter text is not such a complete parallel to 1 Cor. 5:5. It constitutes an exorcism with which a demon is driven out and is given over to chaos. But both text do without doubt give a general background to Paul's formulation. Powerful curses were well-known in both the pagan and the Jewish milieu.[148] The formulation in 1 Cor. 5:5 must therefore be described as a solemn dynamic surrender to the power of evil, a "devotion". It can be equated with the OT curses, with the birkat ha-minim of rabbinic Judaism, and with the above-mentioned pagan formulas. By a curse the deviator is given over to all that which is evil and devilish. And once the judgement has been pronounced, the punishment follows by itself. No further human measure is needed.

But the devotion here has a singular wording. It is above all strange that the surrender to Satan is said to take place so that the spirit can be saved. The outcome is not eternal death, but - as Paul hopes - life. The thought here is the same as in the prologue to the book of Job, where the formulation "hand over to Satan (ὁ διάβολος; השטן)" also occurs: ἰδοὺ παραδίδωμί σοι (=τῷ διαβόλῳ) αὐτόν (Job 2:6). In the court of the heavenly king Satan appears as God's servant, the equivalent of the chief of the secret police for a wordly dictator. Satan receives God's permission to revoke the blessing over Job (1:10), and then, reminiscent of Deut. 28, it is described how the curses come over him. His cattle is stolen or destroyed by the fire of God (Job 1:14-17; cf. Deut. 28:18, 31). His sons and daughters perish (Job 1:18f; cf. Deut. 28:32). He is afflicted with severe abscesses from the soles of his feet to the crown of his head (Job 2:7; Deut. 28:35). All this happens with God's permission. However, Satan is not allowed to take Job's life. Satan has no other power than that which God gives him.

The concept of Satan as God's subordinate servant is not unfamiliar to the NT. In the story of the temptations, the Spirit leads Jesus up to Satan who thus appears as an instrument of God to test Jesus' Sonship (Matt. 4:1).[149] According to 2 Cor. 12:7ff, Satan's angel has a God-given positive task: to prevent Paul from becoming boastful. When now the surrender to Satan in 1 Cor. 5:5 is expected to have a positive effect, we surely are dealing with this concept of Satan's subordinate place.[150]

Consequently, when the fornicator in Corinth was consigned to Satan, this means that he was subjected to the most powerful curse. That he with this curse in practice was thrust out of the community seems obvious. In the New Testament epistles Satan is, throughout, the community's opposite party.[151] To be given over to Satan should have been conceived as being transferred from one area of power (Christ's, i.e. the church) to another (Satan's).[152] But over and above this, no sanctions are made. The curse works by itself. And probably its effect was thought to be as that which is portrayed in Deut. 28 and Job 1-2: material losses, personal tragedies, illnesses, and finally death (cf. Acts 5:1-11).

But Paul is convinced that Satan is God's servant and finally goes on God's errands. In some way the curse stands in the service of the blessing, and Paul can say that the curse takes place in order that the spirit may be saved in the Day of the Lord. But what does this mean?

For the destruction of the flesh, so that the spirit may be saved on the Day of the Lord
(εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου)

It is extremely difficult to know exactly what Paul here means by these expressions. It has shown itself to be possible to build up, and defend, completely different interpretations.

According to Origen "the flesh" meant the carnal mind. Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia interpreted "the flesh" in a similar way, to mean "the lusts of the flesh" and they meant to say that these would be choked by means of penance.[153] But this interpretation is not satisfactory. It does not show how concretely Paul conceived the workings of the curse. "The destruction of the flesh" must signify something far more tangible than moral improvement and restraint. Paul surely expected the total end of the fornicator.

Another, quite opposite interpretation amounts to this, that the body of the fornicator, the seat of sin, would be put to death, by which means his soul would be freed.[154] Then the statement that the spirit will be saved on the Day of the Lord means that the person, the true self,[155] or the soul which is united with Christ[156] will be saved. But

the idea that "flesh" and "spirit" should signify two parts of a person, body and soul, conflicts with Paul's usual use of the terms. Only twice in the epistles of Paul do the opposites "flesh" - "spirit" signify the contrast between body and soul. Both passages are ones of which the authenticity is much debated (2 Cor. 7:1; Col. 2:5). The contrast between body and soul is actually brought to the fore by Paul in 1 Cor. 5:3, but then he uses the words σῶμα - πνεῦμα. Paul is absent in the body (σώματι) but present in the spirit (πνεύματι). In 1 Cor. 5:5 he changes his terminology, and it is thus likely that he means something different.

Normally σάρξ - πνεῦμα denote, in Paul's writings, the contrast between human weakness and the divine power which is foreign to man.[157] In Gal. 3:3, "spirit" is that power which decides the life of the believer, while "flesh" signifies the human reliance on the works of the law (cf. Rom. 2:28f; Gal. 4:23, 29; 5:17; Phil. 3:3). In Rom. 8:4ff "spirit" appears as a norm according to which the Christian lives, or should live, and "flesh" is that form of life which is only human and marked by sin (cf. Gal. 5:19ff, 22ff; 6:8). Thus man is in his entirety either "spirit" or "flesh", depending on whether he lives after the spirit or after the flesh, whether he is united with Christ and is led by the spirit of God, or not. On the other hand - as J. Cambier has recently pointed out - the concept that the body should be destroyed so that the soul could be saved, is completely non-Pauline.[158]

A third interpretation consists of the idea that the divine power of the church, which the fornicator, as a member, had a part in, is now taken away from him, in order that the body of Christ will be complete in the latter day.[159] In the actual text we find nothing to contradict this interpretation.[160] But 1 Pet. 4:6 indicates that the spirit is that of the person who is condemned.[161] And, 1 Tim. 1:20 shows that the surrender to Satan really was conceived as a measure which had a positive effect for the one condemned.

A fourth interpretation sees 1 Cor. 5:5 in the light of the idea of retribution and the atoning effects of suffering and death. By the destruction of the flesh, i.e. by death, the sin of the fornicator is requited. In this way he can already now atone for his crime so that he no longer needs to be punished for it when the latter day comes.[162] The same concept lies behind Josephus' statement that the Essenes would consider the sufferings of the one thrust out to be atoning, and thus receive him back into the sect again (see above, p. 69). And Paul himself seems to reason in a similar way in 1 Cor. 11:30-32. The illnesses and deaths which have occurred in the community constitute a chastisement which will prevent condemnation in the final judgement.[163] This interpretation is also strengthened by the fact that the rabbinic literature contains detailed speculations about the atoning effects of death.[164] The basic rule reads: "All who die are expiated by death".[165] And this rule was also considered to apply to offenders who suffered the death penalty.[166]

But these Jewish speculations on the subject reveal one problem in this interpretation. It was said (at least by the leading rabbis) that, if death was to have this atoning effect, it has to be connected with repentance. That is why a person who was condemned to death was exhorted before the execution to confess his sins. If nothing else, he could say: "May my death atone for my sins". By this formula, which dates back to pre-Christian times, the death of the one condemned to die would atone for his sins.[167]

In 1 Cor. 5:5, admittedly, we find no indication that the fornicator should confess his sin and accept his punishment as just. No time seems to be given for anything like this. But in the thought of punishment there doubtless lies a more or less conscious idea of requital. The punishment atones for the crime and recreates the balance between man and God.[168] Evidently Paul has taken up this thought - without more careful reflection as to the conditions for the saving of the spirit - and applied it to the case in Corinth.

However, in doing this, Paul seems to have referred to his usual usage of the contrasts "flesh" - "spirit". The terminology in 1 Cor. 5:5 is very close to those formulations with which Paul expounds the death of the old man and the life of the new man (cf. particularly Rom. 6:6, 11; Gal. 5:16ff, 24; Col. 2:12-15). It is actually conceivable that Paul is referring to a baptismal formula known to the Corinthians, and according to which the one who was baptized in the name of Jesus was transferred from the domain of Satan to that of Christ, from the sphere of death to that of life; for his old man, his flesh, must die, and his new man, his spirit must live.[169] Now, when the life of the fornicator stands in obvious and conscious contrast to the character of the church, he must once again, in the name of Jesus, be given over to Satan, from where he once came.[170] But this "destruction of the flesh", this death in both the physical and ethic-religious meaning, can in its turn once again lead to life. That process from death to life, which the Christian underwent at baptism and continually has to go through, will painfully but effectively be hastened on behalf of the fornicator.

In 1 Pet. 4:6 we can see how the expressions "flesh" and "spirit" are used in a similar way, at the same time physical and ethic-religious. But here the death of the "flesh" is no longer enough to win the life of the "spirit" - as it seems to be in 1 Cor. 5:5. Christ has to preach the gospel for the dead in order that "though judged in the flesh (σαρκί) like men, they might live in the spirit (πνεύματι) like God".

Thus we find a combination of essentially four patterns of thought underlying 1 Cor. 5:5.

a) The fornicator is exposed to a powerful curse. Like the Old Testament curses it was thought to have concrete results and end in total destruction. No special measures were needed to make the misfortunes effectual.

b) The concrete results of the curse were thought to be put into effect by Satan. But Satan is conceived as a servant of God, and that is why even the worst misfortunes can lead to something good.
c) The punishment of the fornicator means that he can already now expiate for his offence. Therefore, there is reason to hope that he will be saved on the Day of the Lord, i.e. at the final judgement.
d) The community's drastic measure will hasten the same process for the fornicator as the Christian continually has to go through: the "flesh" is destroyed and the "spirit" is saved.

d. Purge Out the Leaven. 5:6-8

On the eve of the 14th of Nisan everything leavened, every little breadcrumb in the Jewish home had to be found, carried out and burned.[171] For seven days, from the afternoon of the 14th, only that which was unleavened could be eaten. Various explanations for this ancient custom were in circulation during the time of the NT.[172] Already in Ex. 12:34 and Deut. 16:3 different ways of interpreting the custom are suggested. The explanation of the Passover haggadah (with analogues in Mekilta and in Philo) says: "These unleavened breads, why do we eat them? Because our fathers' dough did not have time to be leavened before the King of kings revealed himself and saved them."[173] Philo also gives an ethical interpretation in several variants: The leaven is pride, the unleavened dough is humility.[174]

Here, similarly, Paul gives his explanation of the leavened and the unleavened dough. J. Jeremias makes it plausible that Paul makes use of a primitive Christian Passover haggadah.[175] H. Windisch has tried to lay down what in the text constitutes the borrowed cultic formulas, and how Paul, by his additions, has transformed the cultic concepts of the text into ethical ones.[176] Primarily following Windisch we will here try to get a clear picture of Paul's mode of procedure.

By οὐκ οἴδατε Paul gives us to understand that what he now states is already known to the Corinthians.[177] If the interpreting phrases, which are stylistically easy to detach, are peeled away, the following remains:

a) μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ [178]
b) ἐκκαθάρατε [179] τὴν ζύμην [180]
c) καὶ γὰρ τὸ πάσχα [181] ἡμῶν ἐτύθη [182]
d) ὥστε ἑορτάζωμεν [183] μὴ ἐν [184] ζύμῃ παλαιᾷ [185]
e) ἀλλ' ἐν ἀζύμοις [186]

These liturgical sounding formulas seem to have functioned as a summoning introduction to a primitive Christian Passover celebration.[187] As

among the Jews, one cleaned away that which was leavened and used only unleavened bread.[188] But line c) shows that it basically was something other than a Jewish Passover. The pascal lambs of the Jews were to be slaughtered on the 14th of Nisan. But "our", i.e. the Christians', pascal lamb was already slain.

By means of the following additions, Paul has been able to make the text serve his purpose.

Line b): Before ζύμην is inserted παλαιάν.
After ζύμην is added ἵνα ἦτε νέον φύραμα, καθώς ἐστε ἄζυμοι.

Naturally, leaven is old, in the normal meaning of the word, and so it is called in line d). But here Paul gets a chance to refer to his earlier thoughts about the flesh and the spirit, about the old man and the new man.[189] He inserts παλαιάν into the text - even though the word order happens to become different from that in line d). For Paul the leaven now becomes the old man, the flesh, which has to be destroyed, killed, purged out. The new unleavened bread becomes the new man, who has received the spirit and who shall live. Here the indicative and the imperative are woven together in a typically Pauline way.[190] The old dough, the flesh, must be purged out, so that the Corinthians can become a new dough, spirit. But this latter is, in actual fact, what they already are. You are, says Paul, unleavened. That is to say, you have already (through baptism) died and risen again, you are already spiritual.

Line c): After ἐτύθη is added Χριστός.

It is possible that the word Χριστός already stood in the liturgical model. Paul never otherwise presents Christ as the pascal lamb. However, the thought was probably known to Paul and taken for granted in the model. From a stylistic point of view the word seems to be stuck on. It must have come quite naturally to Paul to expressly give the traditional Christian interpretation of the pascal lamb in connection with the interpretation of leavened and unleavened.

Line d): After ἐν ζύμῃ παλαιᾷ is added
μηδὲ ἐν ζύμῃ κακίας καὶ πονηρίας
Line e): After ἐν ἀζύμοις is added
εἰλικρινείας καὶ ἀληθείας
Ἐν ζύμῃ refers back to the Hebr. בשאור
ἐν ἀζύμοις refers back to the Hebr. במצות

In the liturgical model the expressions have the meaning of "with leaven",

"with unleavened bread". When Paul now speaks of the "leaven of corruption and wickedness" and the "unleavened bread of purity and truth", it can seem as if he is contradicting his comments in line b). There the community is equated with "the new dough". Here Paul seems to exhort the community to celebrate the Passover with the unleavened bread.[191] But Paul understands ἐν in its Greek local meaning "in". By this he refers to formulations with which he used to describe just how a person walks in the old or the new context of life, which distinguishes him. The contradiction between Paul's interpretation in line b) and his interpretation in lines d) and e) is in this case nothing more than the contradiction between for example the formulation "he who links himself to Christ is one spirit" (1 Cor. 6:17) and "serve in newness of spirit" (Rom. 7:6). A Christian is spirit, according to Paul, and at the same time, he walks in the spirit. In the same way, Paul here in 1 Cor. 5:6-8 interprets the liturgical model: Christians are unleavened, and at the same time they walk in the unleavened bread of truth and purity.

Thus the ritual instructions in the model about leavened and unleavened bread get, through Paul's additions, a new meaning which is typically Pauline, and which clearly connects on to the earlier part of the chapter.

By reworking the model Paul has given a fundamental motivation for the expulsion procedure. But the motivation is filled with tensions. On the one side, Paul's additions show how the apostle places the new existence against the old. The community has gone over from the sphere of death and the flesh, the old context, to the new context of life and the spirit. The consequences ought to be: He who does not want to walk in the new context has by this himself chosen to stay in the old. Expulsion should, from this way of thinking be considered as the confirmation of a fact: The person concerned no longer belongs to our circle.

But, by taking over the liturgical model, other conceptions have had their influence. In order to preserve its purity, the community has to thrust out that which is impure, just as all leaven was purged out before the Passover. He who does not correspond to the holiness of the church must be rendered harmless, otherwise the whole community can be contaminated. The interest is no longer centred on the welfare of the fornicator but is undividedly directed towards the church and its irreproachability. These are thoughts which we have come to know as being typical of the holiness motif. We shall see how a similar tension characterizes also the concluding section of the chapter.

e. Expulsion of Fornicators and Other Transgressors. 5:9-13

Paul refers to instruction he has given in an earlier letter. There he wrote that the Corinthians should not συναναμίγνυσθαι, mingle with

fornicators. One has assumed that the Corinthians in their letter (cf. 7:1) answered that this was practically impossible, which is why Paul now has to clarify his point of view.[192] But ἔγραψα in v. 11, should in all likelihood, as in v. 9, be understood as a reference to Paul's earlier letter. Paul is not saying anything new. The point is that he is repeating himself. As in 2 Thess. 3 and 2 Cor. 13, Paul is careful to repeat his warnings before definite measures are taken.[193]

Two "catalogues of vices" indicate which persons a Christian should avoid having anything to do with. Such catalogues of vices are common in the NT and in the surrounding Hellenistic literature. Their content is relatively stereotyped. Here are mentioned above all such commandments as were, according to the Jewish point of view, given at creation and thus binding for both Jews and pagans. Fornication as well as idolatry, blasphemy and robbery belonged to the so-called six Adamic commandments.[194]

The immorality Paul turns against does not seem to consist only of a relapse into a pagan way of life (cf. v. 1). The connection with the rest of the chapter also implies that it is here a question of oppositional libertinism. The people against whom measures are to be taken are those who show by their lives that they consciously and intentionally set themselves up against the teaching and the way of life the apostle has proclaimed.

That is why measures of the expulsion type have to be taken. We have seen that συναναμείγνυμι presumably does not imply every association but only such a relationship which is of significance from the point of view of purity. In v. 11 Paul gives an example of such contact: it is forbidden to eat with those who are burdened with grave transgressions.[195]

But the idea that certain people, because of their impurity, have to be partially expelled from the community is combined, in a peculiar way, with another thought. The Christian must not withdraw himself from the world (v. 10). It is not up to Paul or the Corinthians to judge those that stand outside (v. 12f). That is God's concern. The rule for not having anything to do with sinners applies only to the internal relations of the Christians. The Corinthians must have wondered how to put these rules into practice. Presume that the offending brother persisted and had to be totally expelled. Could one then have contact with him, even fellowship with him at meals, seeing he now belonged to those who were without?

Psychologically, the instructions can be explained by the fact that the apostate is generally viewed with more suspicion than someone who has never come into the community. After all, the former has directly set himself up against the norms of the community, while the latter can still be won over to them.[196] But there is also a theological explanation, which definitely was more important.[197]

We have seen that the judgement passed by the community in cases of expulsion was not considered according to either Matt. 18 or 1 Cor. 5, as only an earthly measure. The risen Lord was supposed to take part in the judgement and guarantee the heavenly sanction. This implies that the judgement God will pass on all people in the final judgement, is in a provisional and preparatory way, carried into effect in the church - but only there. As long as a person stands in the eschatological community he stands under the eschatological judgement. If he leaves the community, he can await the final judgement.

By means of this idea, Paul gets the opportunity to unite two fundamentally different motifs. On the one hand: The church is a holy community, in which close contact with impure people must be avoided. On the other hand: Soon the world is to be judged. But that is God's business, and until then, the evil and the good will live side by side.

In conclusion Paul quotes the formula common in Deut.: You must get rid of the evil.[198] We have seen that in the Hebrew passages the formula was directed more against the evil deed than the offender himself. In the LXX הרע is translated alternatively with τὸ πονηρὸν and ὁ πονηρός.[199] Paul chooses the latter expression. Not only sin, not only the evil mind, has to be cleaned out of the community. Also, those persons who have transgressed against the norms must be expelled - at least partially.

4. 1 John 5:16-17

a. Place and Function of the Passage in 1 John

1 John 5:14-21 stands in a much disputed relationship to the rest of the letter. Stylistic and theological grounds have been given for the conception that the author of the letter ended his writing with 5:13, and that 5:14-21 is an addition by a later church redaction.[200]

R. Bultmann maintained in 1927 that 1 John is based on a model which in form and content had the same character as the revelation speeches in the gospel of John.[201] In 1951 Bultmann extended his hypothesis by maintaining that 1 John had furthermore undergone a redaction by the church. These very verses, 5:14-21, the conclusion of the letter, belonged to the editorial addition.[202]

The distinction which is introduced here between deadly sins and other sins is, according to Bultmann, completely foreign to the rest of the letter. In 1 John 1:5ff the Christian life is understood as being under forgiveness. Therefore, paradoxically enough, to fellowship with God and to walking in the light belongs also confession of sin.[203] That is why the author - or, according to Bultmann, already the model - can on the

one hand exhort the readers to confession of their sins (1:8, 10) and on the other hand say that "no man who dwells in him sins" (3:6, cf. v. 8).[204] This dialectic understanding of the Christian life has been, in 1 John 5:16f, sacrificed in favour of the church ambition to keep the community clean from more serious sins. While 3:4 defines each sin as lawlessness, ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία, 5:17, in a peculiar way takes back a similar definition, πᾶσα ἀδικία ἁμαρτία ἐστίν, καὶ ἔστιν ἁμαρτία οὐ πρὸς θάνατον.[205]

The church redaction's answer to the question about the sin of the Christian is therefore (according to Bultmann) in line with the solution given in Hebr. where apostasy, intentional sin and fornication are presumed to be unforgivable sins, and in The Shepherd of Hermas, where the blaspheming of God's name, apostasy and treachery are described as unforgivable.

H. Windisch agrees with Bultmann's thesis about a model which was adapted.[206] He suggests also that a slight redactional revision could be possible, to which, for example, 5:14-17(18) could be assigned. Even Windisch maintains that the solution to the problem of "the Christian and sin", which is given in 5:16f, differs from that which is given in 1:6 - 2:6 and 3:4-12.

H. Preisker accepts Bultmann's assumption of the existence of a model containing revelation speeches. Furthermore, he assumes the existence of another model of eschatological content. He counts, for example, 5:18f, in a more original state, as belonging to this other model.[207]

R. Schnackenburg finds Bultmann's theory about 1 John 5:14-21 to be well-founded. In the introduction to his commentary he seems to primarily concur with the variant that friends or disciples of the author of the letter added a page (cf. John 20:31).[208] However, in the actual commentary Schnackenburg takes it for granted that also the conclusion is the author's own work. That a new theme is introduced at the end of the letter is explained by the author's associative way of presentation.[209]

Even if 5:14-21 is an addition by a redaction, it is clearly linked with the rest of the letter.[210] It is therefore legitimate to ask whether the expression "sin unto death" should be understood as a description of particularly serious sins or if it should be understood through the dualism between life and death which runs through the letter.

b. What is "Sin unto Death"?

In the OT we come across the natural juridic distinction between unintentional sins and sins which are committed "with lifted hand" (Lev. 4:27; Num. 15:27, 30). The distinction is taken up in 1QS VIII 17, 22, 24, where different punishments are meted out for intentional or deceitful

offences and unintentional offences.[211] Also in Jewish Hellenistic writings do we find this distinction made.[212]

It should be observed that this distinction rather refers to two different ways of committing a sin than of two kinds of sin. The same deed can naturally on one occasion be described as unintentional, and on another be qualified as intentional or deceitful.

A similar distinction reappears in Hebr. 10:26 but with different terms. He who sins of his own free will after having received knowledge of the truth cannot, according to this passage, count on any atonement. A few parallel formulations underline the seriousness of his crime. He "has trampled under foot the Son of God", "profaned the blood of the covenant by which he was consecrated" and "affronted the Spirit of grace". The expressions do not describe the actual crime, so that certain deeds could be assigned to this category. It is rather the attitude of the sinner which is described. It is not the offence in itself which is unforgivable, but if it is a conscious expression of the sinner's attitude, then he has placed himself beyond the possibility of reconciliation.[213]

We have come across a somewhat different distinction in CD IX 6-22. There we find the distinction between דבר מות and על הממון, capital cases and cases concerning property. The distinction seems to refer to the fact that Deut. 17:6 demands "two or three" witnesses for the death penalty, while Deut. 19:15 demands "two or three" witnesses for "any charge". How are these two Bible passages to be reconciled? Well, answers CD IX, for sentence to be able to be passed in capital cases, three witnesses are needed, but in, for example, cases concerning property, it is enough with two. Here "capital cases" means cases in which the death penalty could be meted out.

As far as terminology is concerned, we come closer to 1 John in Jub. 21:22[214] and 26:34[215] where sins unto death are spoken of, and possibly in Test. Issachar 7:1 where, however, the text is uncertain and a Christian interpolation cannot be excluded. Billerbeck also brings forward bSot 48a where the expression עון מיתה appears in a statement which is attributed to John Hyrcanus.[216] In these cases the formulation seems to be intended to describe specific deeds as being particularly serious sins.

The author of 1 John 5:15-16 has in all probability taken the term "sin unto death" from this Jewish tradition. But how does he make use of it? Does he differentiate between trifling sins and serious sins? Or does he refer rather to the Old Testament distinction between intentional and unintentional sin? Does he understand "sin unto death" as a traditional description of certain sins? Or does he refer to the dualism in the letter between life and death?

Let us look at the ideas of the context. The central thought in the section 5:13-21 is without doubt the dualism between life and death. The author gives the whole aim of the letter as being, that the readers should

know that those who "believe in the name of the Son of God" have "eternal life" (v. 13). What this eternal life is, is explained in more detail in what follows. It means first of all παρρησία (freedom, confidence, v. 14), secondly sinlessness (v. 18), and thirdly understanding and union with "him who is true" (v. 20). Against this eternal life stands the sphere of death which is controlled by "the evil one" to whom the whole world belongs (v. 19). The boundary betweeen these two spheres seems to be fundamentally unbroken. He who is born of God does not sin, and "the evil one" "does not touch him" (v. 18).

The word παρρησία is used outside the NT for describing the free citizen's right to free speech and for describing a free-spoken frank attitude.[217] In the NT it is used, for example, to characterize the Christians' open frankness among each other and their confidence in preaching and testifying. We find the word four times in 1 John for describing the Christian's relationship to God. In 2:28 and 4:17 it describes the Christian's confidence before God on the day of judgement, and in 3:21 the freedom to pray to God and to be answered. In a similar way the eternal life is characterized in 5:14f as an openhearted, free-spoken and trusting relationship to God.

Παρρησία is namely explained as meaning a condition in which one knows that one has that which one has prayed to God about. The thought seems strange; particularly v. 15 has been understood as a complex-sentence of supposed logic which in actual fact says nothing: "And if we know that he hears us, whatever we pray about, we know that we have that which we have prayed to him about". It is thought that the main clause states the same thing as the sub-clause has already said.[218] But, in actual fact, an important difference does exist. The sub-clause expresses only certainty that the prayer will be heard, while the main clause expresses that the prayer, because of this certainty, is already granted. Παρρησία , the certainty that prayer is effective, is at one and the same time, the prerequisite and the object of the prayer.

Assume now that a member of the community sins. Seeing that he who is born of God does not sin (v. 18), this means, in principle, that the sinner has shown himself to belong to the sphere of the world or of "the evil one". But just because of παρρησία this strict dualistic principle can be broken through. That brother who has παρρησία , can pray for the sinner, and thus "grant him life".[219] In other words, effective prayer goes with eternal life, and that is why one can pray a sinner over from death to life. In this case the sin does not lead to death. That which is important for the author is not, first and foremost, that certain sins are sins unto death. What is important is the surprising fact that certain sins do <u>not</u> lead to death.

But a prerequisite for this is, of course, that the sinner himself wants to go over to life. As this not always is the case, the author has to admit that there are sins which lead to death. If the sinner does not want

to receive life, it is of little use to pray for him. Note that v. 16 does not forbid such prayers. Therefore it is probably wrong to see in the refusal to pray a special sanction directed against particularly serious sinners.[220] One can rather see v. 16 as a sign that charismatic devotions did not exist in the author's milieu. Only when the sinner repented was it necessary for the community to pray.[221]

Against this background it is also significant that sin unto death is not specified more closely. Neither heresy nor murder nor idolatry is mentioned in this connection.[222] Sin unto death can evidently be any sin which implies open apostasy from the sphere of eternal life, an intentional cutting off of the life-giving fellowship with God and Christ.[223]

Two things follow on from this. First of all, it is not completely correct to maintain that "sin unto death" is the same as "unforgivable sins". It is not a question of certain deeds being classed as so serious that they cannot be forgiven. The thought is rather this, that in principle, all sins lead one out of the sphere of life, but that forgiveness breaks the dualism, while those sins which are not forgiven, because of their nature, lead to death.

Secondly, this breaking through of the dualism implies that 1 John 5:14-21, in this respect, stands on the same plane as the rest of the letter. The certainty of being heard when one is praying for forgiveness for someone else fits in well with the "dialectic" exposition in the letter that forgiveness belongs to walking in the light (1:7ff). Also 5:17 can be explained from the point of view of the letter's "dialectic". The contradiction between, on the one hand, "all wrongdoing is sin", and on the other hand, "but there is sin which is not unto death" is none other than that between "no man who remains in him sins" (3:6) on the one hand and "if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just and will forgive our sins and cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1:9) on the other. In principle, every wrongdoing is sin and implies that one no longer remains in God. But the dualism is broken by forgiveness. Not every sin leads to death, because Jesus forgives sin.

This does not mean to say that 1 John 5:14-21 is written by the author of the letter. There can be other reasons for the supposition that the passage is an addition.

The writer of 1 John 5:16-17 has, then, made use of a term "sin unto death" which was traditionally used for particularly serious sins. But he has used it in a way which refers more to the Old Testament distinction between intentional and unintentional sins. By doing this he has developed a dialectic view of the Christian life: The dualism between life and death is broken by forgiveness. In spite of the fact that the sphere of life and the sphere of death are separated from each other, there are sins which do not lead to death. One can pray for such a sinner and "grant him life". On the other hand, if the sinner refuses to accept life, his sin, because of its nature, leads to eternal death. In such a case, neither prayer nor any other measure is required from the community.

5. Rev. 2-3

a. Place of the Letters in the Book of Revelation

The so-called letters to the churches are in actual fact no letters at all.[224] They are literary products, all built up in the same way, all connected with the introductory vision of Christ and the portrayal which follow after them.[225] What place do they occupy in the composition?

According to 1:11, the whole of Revelation constitutes a book which is to be sent to the seven churches in Asia Minor. 1:19 gives, in broad outline, the arrangement of the book: It deals with "what you have seen" (Ch. 1), "what is" (Chs. 2-3) and "what is to come hereafter" (Chs. 4-21). The question as to how the greater section is put together is much debated.[226] For us it is enough to notice that it is the main section (Chs. 4-21) which constitutes the actual revelation. Yes, not even the whole of the main section stands on the same level, because the revelation is not just written down in a book, it also has to do with a book roll which slowly opens and reveals more and more of the eschatological course of events. Not until the seventh seal is broken (8:1) can the secret writing be clearly read.

In this slow, lengthy disclosure the "letters" play no independent role. It is clear that they only belong to the introduction. But they have an important function: they legitimize the relevator as that Lord who knows the spiritual condition of each church. And they make the revelation which follows an urgent message to each one of these churches. Therefore the majestic introductory formula τάδε λέγει in the same style as the proclamations of the great kings of Asia.[227] Therefore the continually recurring formula οἶδα τά ἔργα σου.[228] Therefore, finally, those words of victory which conclude every letter and place the promises of the final visions in connection with the destiny of each individual church. Without the "letters" the Book of Revelation would be comprehended by its readers as nothing but an enumeration of the catastrophes of the last days. With these "letters" Revelation is given an urgent message to its addressees. The book describes the future of their churches, and behind it all stands the Lord of their churches.

b. Problems of the Churches

Even if the "letters" constitute more of an introductory appeal than seven independent letters, they can give valuable information about conditions in the churches in Asia Minor during the time of Domitian. The elevated style means that we cannot expect any clear rules or factual descriptions about cases of expulsion. But we get a picture of the difficulties the

churches had to fight against and of "John's" own attitude towards these difficulties.

The churches were to a great extent exposed to outside pressures. About the church in Smyrna says the "I" of the "letter", that he knows its θλῖψις, i.e. the tribulation, the oppression of the eschatological time,[229] its πτωχεία, i.e. its material poverty and its βλασφημία, i.e. that slander that the church is exposed to from those who call themselves "Jews" but are "Satan's synagogue". This latter expression shows that the church, like the synagogue, claimed to consist of true Jews. Both groups shouted each other down with insulting abuses.[230] In such a situation the inner unity of both groups should have been considerably strengthened, and sanctions against those who transgressed the norms should have been strict. What it actually was like, we shall see later.

The church also has persecutions to expect. Some will be thrown into prison, and the oppression (θλῖψις) shall last for ten days. The seriousness of the situation is brought home by the exhortation: Be faithful till death.

In Pergamum, a witness mentioned by name, Antipas, has been killed, which event seems to have some connection with a pagan cult. The expression "where Satan has his throne" is considered to refer to a gigantic Zeus altar or to the Asclepius cult or to a temple to the honour of Augustus and Roma.

Even in Philadelphia there are those who belong to "Satan's synagogue". Some of them will join the church. But external difficulties are still to be expected anyway. "The time of testing" is to fall upon the whole world.

It is not necessary to deal more closely here with the exterior problems the churches faced. It is enough to notice that the churches, or in any case certain of them, were exposed to persecution from Jews as well as pagans, that in some cases the persecution led to death, and that the author comprehended this as a part of the great eschatological adversity.

From our point of view it is more interesting to observe the inner problems in the churches. In Ephesus "evil men" appear, and "liars" "who claim to be apostles". Furthermore are mentioned the "practices of the Nicolaitains". In Pergamum there are "Nicolaitans" and "some that hold to the teaching of Balaam". In Thyatira the woman Jezebel appears as a prophetess and teacher.[231] Sardis is criticized for being spiritually dead, Laodicea for being lukewarm.

It is not easy to say what is hidden behind these different designations. The similarity between 2:2 and 2:6 points towards the lying apostles and the Nicolaitans being different designations for the same group. 2:14 is most probably to be understood as a description of the Nicolaitans in 2:15. The meaning is, that as Balaam, according to tradition, seduced the children of Israel,[232] so the church (καὶ σύ) has

some who, in the same way, (ὁμοίως) hold fast to the teaching of the Nicolaitans.[233] The prophetess Jezebel and Balaam are blamed for exactly the same thing (2:14, 20). It is therefore likely that the different designations do not refer to groups which are clearly distinct from each other. It is a matter of one single tendency, from the author's point of view heretical, which has made inroads into several of the churches.

The advocators for this trend seem to have claimed certain offices. Those who called themselves apostles (2:2) we can think of as itinerant preachers who, at their arrival in Ephesus, were "tested" and found not to come up to the standard.[234] The primitive Christian literature often warns against people like this (2 Cor. 11:4; 2 John 7-10; 2 Pet. 2:1; Did. 11-12; Ign. Eph. 9:1; Smyr. 4:1) and exhorts the churches to try them (Matt. 7:15; 1 Thess. 5:20f; 1 John 4:1). That it is said of the church in Ephesus that it hated the deeds of the Nicolaitans (2:6) does not necessarily mean that there were Nicolaitans in the church. It is more likely to think that it is the deeds of the apostles that were turned away which have shown themselves to be Nicolaitan.

The woman Jezebel in Thyatira claimed to be a prophetess (2:20).[235] Even if it is not expressly stated, the author means that she had no right to this title.[236] As a prophetess she taught the people and thus led astray the members of the church to do fornication and to eat food offered to idols. Are these expressions to be understood literally or symbolically? The fact that the expressions are traditional ones, points towards a symbolic interpretation (Num. 25:1-2). But on the other hand, both fornication and the eating of food offered to idols constituted ethical problems in the primitive church (Acts 15; 1 Cor. 5; 10). It is possible that the expressions are used in a wide meaning, both as literal fornication, literal participation in sacrificial meals, and other unfaithfulness and idolatry.

2:24 gives an interesting attribute to the Nicolaitans. The followers of Jezebel say that they know τὰ βαθέα τοῦ σατανᾶ. The expression can have been taken ironically, making the Nicolaitans claim to have learned to know the depths of God (cf. Rom. 11:33; 1 Cor. 2:10; Eph. 3:18), while the author maintains that the depths they have learned to know are those of Satan.[237] However, there also existed gnostic trends which maintained that a spiritual person should get to know the depths of Satan, i.e. one should bodily take part in the immorality of the pagan life, e.g. sacrificial feasts and fornication, while one's spiritual inner life remained unaffected.[238] In whatever way the words are understood, it is clear that the Nicolaitans constituted a gnostic trend.

Let me summarize: The author of the "letters" turns against a uniform trend which he calls "Nicolaitan" and which he understands to be heretical. This school carries on a certain mission (the false apostles), and has become well established in certain churches (claim offices); it is libertine in its practices (fornication and food offered to idols) and gnostic in its teaching (the depths of Satan).

c. Sanctions against Heretics

How are the churches now to come to grips with these heretics? The strange thing is that, in spite of the seriousness of the situation of the churches, we are told practically nothing about sanctions against the enemies of the church. Goguel maintains outright that disciplinary measures are never mentioned in the "letters". The churches are blamed for their leniency with the heretics or praised for hating their teaching, "mais nulle part il n'est question de mesures disciplinaires prises contre eux et l'auteur, peu suspect d'indulgence à leur égard, ne demande pas qu'il en soit pris".[239] Even if the moderation of the "letters" is striking, the formulation seems to be too general, which a quick going through will show.

Ephesus: As we have seen, the false apostles are presumably itinerant preachers who have arrived at Ephesus. The church has by testing found out that their deeds are Nicolaitan, for which reason they were not taken into the fellowship. Strictly speaking, there is no question of expulsion. But the passage shows that disciplinary measures could be taken against preachers who tried to enter the community but whose teachings deviated from the norms of the community.

Pergamum: The church is criticized for containing Nicolaitans. They are exhorted to repent (μετανόησον οὖν). If they do not, the "I" of the "letter" will come and make war against the Nicolaitans with the sword of his mouth. R. H. Charles comments: "The Seer requires the Church of Pergamum to expel them, as the Church of Ephesus had already done".[240] But this interpretation - diametrically opposed to Goguel's - is not nuanced enough either. "Repent" is a constant formulation in the "letters" (2:5, 16, 21, 22; 3:3, 19) and never normally denotes an exhortation to expel anyone. On the other hand, repentance is said to consist of "returning to the deeds of the first period", of "making an end to fornication", and "preserving the word". That the church of Pergamum had to repent should therefore mean that they had to see to it that the deeds of the Nicolaitans ceased. This of course means that the Nicolaitans were subjected to a certain pressure. By means of admonitions and attempts at persuasion, and perhaps also by means of direct sanctions, they would be prevailed upon to think again. If this does not succeed, the heretics will be subjected to the sharp sword, i.e. the eschatological punishment that Rev. 19:15ff speaks of. If the church had a disciplinary practice at its disposal (which considering 2:2 seems likely), the exhortation to repentance could be understood as a request to expel, if necessary. But it is striking that such measures are not expressly enjoined.

Thyatira: The church is criticized for "tolerating the woman Jezebel". Here instead the "I" of the "letter" will send sickness, distress and death over Jezebel, her partners and her children. But the punishment

is not meted out unconditionally; it will only be put into effect "if they do not repent" (2:22). The author seems to imply that even for these serious sins, the possibility of remedy does exist.[241]

One has behind the different formulations wanted to distinguish different groups of people who had varying degrees of closeness in their contact with Jezebel, and who therefore should be affected by different punishments. However, the language is of such a symbolic character and seems so influenced by the Semitic style, that one should rather take the parallel phrases as expressions for the same punishment.[242] The great eschatological calamity will particularly affect Jezebel and her faithful followers.

It is not clearly stated what measures the church was to take against Jezebel. However, the situation does show certain similarities with 1 Cor. 5. In both cases the church has neglected its duty to take action against a libertine church member. In both cases the guilty one is threatened with a punishment which affects both body and soul and which has eschatological overtones. It is therefore not improbable that the measure the author expected of the church is expulsion, possibly in the form of a devotion.

Also the punishment which threatens the church of Sardis is a part of the eschatological affliction: "I shall come upon you like a thief" (3:3; cf. Matt. 24:43; Luke 12:39; 1 Thess. 5:2ff; 2 Pet. 3:10). Here the earthly church is given no other instruction than to preserve the word, repent and watch.

Finally, the church of Laodicea is neither cold nor hot and therefore has to hear the words: "I will spit you out of my mouth". Also here it is probably the final judgement which is referred to. No measures of expulsion type are implied.

We find then that disciplinary measures are presupposed in the letter to Ephesus and implied in the letters to Pergamum and Thyatira. But in spite of the often vehement and threatening formulations in the letters, we find no express exhortations to expel anyone. It is very probable that according to "John" sanctions should be taken against heretics, but we are not told how one in practice should set about doing this.

d. The Letters and the Religious "Zeal"

M. Hengel, among others, has shown that "zeal" (קנאה , ζῆλος) constituted an important element in Judaism after the time of the Maccabees.[243] It was most strongly stressed by the Zealots who combined religious ardour with violent political activity; but one can also speak of zeal outside of the organized Zealot party.

It is clear that this zeal has left its mark on parts of Rev. The

imminent eschatological expectation, the contempt for the Roman world empire, the willingness to submit to martyrdom, the thought of the holy war - such features connect Zealotism with Rev.

Even the "letters" contain Zealot features.[244] In this section I will discuss a few of these features and their possible influence on rules of membership.

In the Jewish tradition of zeal one referred above all to two Old Testament situations:[245] the zeal of Phinehas when the Israelites sinned with the daughters of Moab (Num. 25), and the zeal of Elijah and his followers against the prophets of Baal and the house of Ahab (1 Kings 18:40; 19:14; 2 Kings 10:16f).

Num. 25 tells how the daughters of Moab seduced the Israelites and got them to take part in the sacrificial food offered to Baal of Peor. When Phinehas saw an Israelite lead a Midianite woman into the camp, he was seized with zeal and killed both the man and the woman single-handed. In Num. 25:11 the deed is said to be an expression of God's zeal and at the same time to have averted God's zealous wrath against his people. The later tradition praised Phinehas for his deed and held him up as a pattern for holy zeal.[246] He was considered as one of the great patriarchs.[247] But the real instigator of Israel's fall was, according to Num. 31:16, Balaam. The rabbinic tradition, as well as Philo, bore this in mind.[248] Balaam was presented as a type of those who seduce Israel to fornication and idolworship. That is why Phinehas was also placed in connection with Balaam's death. He had prevented Balaam from fleeing through the air or he had killed him himself.[249]

Elijah's zeal consisted of his slaying of the prophets of Baal after the sacrifice competition on Mount Carmel (1 Kings 18:40; 19:14). Because of his action he had to flee from Queen Jezebel who had put to death the prophets of the Lord (1 Kings 18:4; 19:2) and who was also behind the story of Naboth's vineyard (1 Kings 21). Through Elisha came then the Lord's command to Jehu to exterminate the house of Ahab and Jezebel (2 Kings 9:7). Jehu did so, which is described as "zeal for the Lord" (2 Kings 10:16). Particularly Elijah's zeal occupied the imagination, and in the rabbinic tradition Elijah and Phinehas sometimes melted together into one figure.[250]

It cannot be a mere coincidence that the letters in their depiction of heretics in the churches refer to just Balaam and Jezebel (2:14, 20), the two foremost examples of situations in which zeal was appropriate. It could hardly be said more clearly that the situation in the churches demanded a holy zeal.

A few more features of zeal can be observed. The threats which follow on the exhortations in the "letters" to Pergamum and Thyatira are also coloured by zeal. Against the heretics in Pergamum Christ will make war with the sword of his mouth (Rev. 2:16; cf. 1:16; 19:15), an expression which is based on Isa. 11:4 and 49:2 and which in Jewish

literature was used about the Messiah's domination over the peoples and his final judgement (Ps. Sol. 17:27, 39; 1 Enoch 62:2; cf. 4 Ezra 13:4; 2 Thess. 2:8; Hebr. 4:12). As Rev. 19:11-16 speaks about the rider who judges and fights in righteousness, he who has eyes of flame and a cloak dipped in blood, who strikes the people with the sword of his mouth and rules them with a rod of iron - so speaks also for example, Ps. Sol. 17:23-51 about the Son of David who will purge Jerusalem from the nations and crush the substance of the sinners with a rod of iron and destroy the ungodly with the word of his mouth. It is these violent conceptions which are brought to the fore in the threat against Pergamum. The emphasis in the mention of the sword of the mouth is not on the convicting power of the teaching or anything like that, but on the violent destruction of the adversaries.

Jezebel's supporters in Thyatira are also threatened with violent punishment. The expressions in 2:23 are particularly intense, where Old Testament formulations should lead one's thought to a revengeful and condemning Lord (cf. Ps. 7:10; Jer. 11:20; 17:10).

The majestic statements of Christ and the letter formulations τάδε λέγει ... εἰ δὲ μή which are modelled on the proclamations of the Caesars, express a thought which runs throughout Rev.: The real ruler does not live in Rome, but it is the Lord who holds the power in his hand.[251] Similarly it was a principle for the Zealots not to recognize anyone else but God as lord and ruler.[252]

Even the martyr ideal connects the "letters" with the Zealot stream in Judaism. In 2:10 the church is exhorted to be faithful till death, and in the words of victory (2:11) it is promised that the second death, damnation, will not hurt them - i.e. those who are affected by the first death. The martyr Antipas in Pergamum is praised for his faithfulness "where Satan dwells". The ethical ideal is clearly expressed in the word ὑπομονή which is primarily a technical term for the steadfastness of the martyr (Rev. 2:2, 3, 19; 3:10).[253] In the same way, the martyr ideal was alive among the Zealots. Even Josephus has to admit that they endured all possible tortures almost with joy, rather than call Caesar "Lord".[254] This contempt of the pagan state and this willingness to suffer rather than acknowledge the political domination are combined in such a way as to remind one of Rev.

But have these features of zeal in the letters had any influence on the expulsions? The remarkable thing is that the author is so restrained as far as prescribing measures against the inner and outer enemies of the churches is concerned. The zealous imagery has no counterpart in any zealous practice. The churches are sometimes reproached for their laxity and in this there can lie an unspoken demand for disciplinary measures, but it is not made tangible by express instructions. The threats which are directed at the churches are admittedly vehement, but he who is to put the punishments into effect is always Christ himself.[255] Now,

one could think that this is only an expression for that spiritual authority which the church had for exercising church discipline. But this interpretation is not possible in 2:5 (I shall remove your candlestick from its place), in 3:3 (you will not know the moment I come over you) and in 3:16 (I will spit you out of my mouth), where the churches are assumed to be passive. And in Thyatira, where the threats clearly refer to earthly punishments, the church is not exhorted to take any measures at all: "On you I will impose no further burden. Only hold fast to what you have, until I come" (2:24f).[256]

B. Which Deviations Led to Expulsion?

1. The Synoptic Gospels

The prospect of finding any express rules for expulsion in the synoptic gospels is a limited one. First of all, the gospels do not claim to give concrete instructions about the life of the community as do for example, the Manual or the epistles of Paul. The gospels are of a different literary genre. The statement of the gospel of John that the stories were written down to awaken faith in Jesus Christ (John 20:31), applies to the same extent to the synoptics.

Secondly, it is clear that the Christian community which the gospels expressly portray, the Jesus fellowship, is described throughout as a loosely organized group. Judging from the synoptics, in the group around Jesus one was not particularly interested to construct legal community forms. The demands of Jesus were first and foremost directed toward the individual and not to the group as such.

But it is still possible that the gospels, and in this section particularly the synoptics, can tell us something about expulsion from the community. Even a community which lacks juridical forms can have its binding norms and its system of sanctions. Therefore, we can inquire into which kinds of conduct, according to the presentation in the synoptics, made it impossible for a person to remain in the community.

Furthermore, the life of the church up to the time of the evangelists has undoubtedly influenced the formulation of the tradition. The fact that the church's organization terminology is very sparse in the synoptics,[257] should, however, be a warning. It is evident that influence from the ecclesiastical life was seldom direct and explicit. In our analysis of Matt. 18 we saw how it could come about. The traditions were amplified, touched up, and arranged so that they would say something about the church situation. In that way we can indirectly infer what rules for expulsion functioned in the church of the evangelist.

Therefore in the following I will briefly go through the synoptic words about the limits of the fellowship around Jesus, in order to get an answer to the above question. In so doing I will try to differentiate between what the texts say expressly about the Jesus fellowship and what they say indirectly about the church after the death and resurrection of Jesus.

What did the analysis of Matt. 18 give us? In vs. 15-17 we saw how a word of Jesus - corresponding to Luke 17:3f - was amplified and reformed into a rule about how one was to proceed with deviators. If efforts to bring back the deviator fail, the church has the right to consider him as expelled from the community. But it does not state what deviations were to lead to such a measure being taken. Rather than the concrete offence, its seems to be the unwillingness to listen to the reproving which places the deviator outside the limits of the community.

We saw too that Matthew, by his redaction of the material, moves the emphasis from expulsion to the efforts to bring back the offender and the duty to forgive.

In Matt. 18:8-9 we found that the traditional material, which earlier had nothing to do with expulsion, is presented by the evangelist in such a way that it now comes to deal with church discipline. Matthew hints that it is the seducer, he who causes other members to fall, who must be excluded from the community.

This restraint as far as laying down obstacles which would prevent membership, is characteristic of the whole of the synoptic material. Jesus mixes freely with people who would normally be more or less disqualified from participation in a religious community. He eats with toll-collectors and sinners (Mark 2:14f par; Luke 19:1ff), allows women to receive instruction (Luke 10:38ff), receives children (Mark 10:14 par), exhorts people to follow him immediately - without a novitiate and examinations (Mark 1:16ff par) teaches about one's obligation to forgive (Matt. 6:12 par; Luke 17:3f). This openness is, according to the synoptics, programmatic (Matt. 7:1; 11:28 par; 13:24ff) and stirs up bad blood among religiously conscious people (Mark 2:16 par; Luke 15:2; 19:7; Matt. 11:19).

But this does not mean that the Jesus fellowship in the synoptics is presented as something synonymous with modern humanistic tolerance. Side by side with the well-known words about the lack of conditions in the fellowship around Jesus we also come across a whole series of "intolerant" words in which Jesus expresses himself in a discouraging way, and in which the community around him stands out as being exclusive in a certain sense, difficult to become a part of, and demanding. We find such words in Mark 3:28f par; 6:11 par; 7:27 par; 8:34 par, 38 par; Matt. 7:6, 15; 10:5, 11, 32f par, 37f par; 18:8-9; Luke 14:33.

One group of the above-mentioned texts gives in a pointed form conditions for participation in the Jesus fellowship (Mark 8:34 par; Matt.

10:37f par; Luke 14:33). There is, however, an interesting discrepancy between the form and content of these words. The meaning is evidently that those who join Jesus have to count on the most serious consequences. But formally these consequences are given as conditions. Why?

This is explained if one assumes that Jesus here refers to known rules for entrance into religious communities. In Qumran as in the rabbinic literature we find rules of entry with a linguistic structure which agrees with Mark 8:34 par: a) Everyone who wants to join b) must fulfil that and that condition c) and then he can join.

1QS VI 13ff

a) And everyone (וכול) from Israel that is willing to join the council of the community,
b) the Examiner at the head of the Many shall test him with respect to his insights and his actions.
And if he grasps instruction
c) he shall bring him into the covenant.

CD XIII 11f

a) And everyone (וכל) that joins his (the Overseer's) congregation
b) let him examine him about his actions and his understanding and his strength and his courage and his property;
c) and they shall write him down in his place....

bBekh 30b (I choose one of several examples:)

a) If anyone applies to become an associate
b) if we saw him practising these (obligations) privately at his house,
c) we receive him.....

pDem II 22d [258]

a) Everyone (כל) that comes (to enter the fellowship)[259]
b) must impose upon himself (the obligations).

Mark 8:34 follows the scheme (as does Matt. 16:24):

a) If anyone[260] wants to follow me
b) let him deny himself and take up his cross
c) and then he may follow me.

But instead of such conditions for membership which used to be given in line b) (examinations, novitiates, promises), the utmost readiness to sacrifice is given. Instead of observable measurable demands which belong to organized communities, we find radical demands which work inwardly in the individual: preparedness to sacrifice oneself and to meet

scorn and death. It seems likely that this way of utilizing the rules of membership goes back to Jesus himself. Possibly Mark, and after him Matthew, expanded line b) with the word about taking up one's cross. Finally Luke, with the addition of "daily" (Luke 9:23) has somewhat blunted the radical demand and made an obligation to daily ethical endeavour.

In any case, it is clear that these words in no way give or imply sanctions of a disciplinary nature against those who already are members.

Another group of the texts mentioned above expresses a negative attitude to people outside the fellowship. Mark 7:24-30 (=Matt. 15:21-28) and Matt. 10:5 tells that basically Jesus limited his work, and that of his disciples, to Israel. Behind this apparently lies a concept of salvation history. The gospel first had to go to the Israel, and after that to the pagans.[261]

Mark 6:11 (=Matt. 10:14; Luke 9:5; 10:11; cf. Acts 13:51; 18:6) and Matt. 10:11 give expression to the mission practice of the early church. When the disciples come to a place they have to find someone who is worthy (ἄξιος , Matt. 10:11) and stay there. But worthiness does not consist of being reliable on questions of purity as it did in Qumran or in the Pharisaic community.[262] One becomes worthy of the message by receiving its representatives and listening to them (cf. Matt. 10:13f; 22:8)[263] and by giving priority to the Jesus fellowship before all else (Matt. 10:37f). If the disciples are not received at a certain place they are to go away from there and shake the dust off their feet (Mark 6:11 par). This drastic rite implies that the people in that place are considered as unclean, and their district is to be treated as unclean land.[264] But the category clean-unclean is used more as incidental illustration than as an independent theme. The uncleanness is but an expression for the people's unwillingness to listen. The ritual gesture of the disciples indicates a sharp boundary between their community and those who will not listen. But it is the latter who have placed themselves outside the community, and any measures to expel them are not needed. The rite does not seem to mean any definite rejection either. But it will be counted as evidence against the disobedient at the coming judgement.[264a]

Matt. 7:6 expresses in the first half of the verse, that certain people are to be considered as unclean, like dogs and swine, and that that which is holy is not to be given to them. Taken by itself this half of the verse gives the impression of being a general unspecified word of wisdom.[265] It states with a figure of speech the rule which is typical of the holiness motif: The holy belongs to the holy (see above p. 32). But this general maxim came to be understood more concretely. The second half of the verse (possibly an addition) expounds and motivates the first half in two phrases in chiastic order. Here the "dogs" and "swine" are people who can attack and injure those who hold in trust that which is holy. Now the words seem to constitute a factual parallel to Mark 6:11 par. It seems to be the disobedient, those who will not listen, who are

to be treated as unclean. In Did. 9:3 the words are interpreted still more precisely: that which is holy is the Lord's Supper and the dogs are those who are not baptized. But neither here is it a question of certain people needing to be expelled because of some contracted uncleanness.[266] Conclusion: Matt. 7:6 speaks neither directly nor indirectly about expulsion.[266a]

Thus, in none of the above synoptic passages, is there any trace whatsoever of disciplinary measures against members of the community.

A third group of sayings circle round the theme confess - deny: Matt. 10:32f (=Luke 12:8f); Mark 8:38 (=Luke 9:26). He who confesses Christ before the people, him will Jesus (or the Son of Man) confess before the Father (or before God's angels). But he who denies him, is ashamed of him and his word, Jesus (or the Son of Man) will deny, be ashamed of before the Father (or before God's angels or at his coming). Particularly Matt. 10:32f and Luke 12:8f clearly refer to a situation of persecution. Even in such difficult circumstances the members of the community have to hold fast to their confession. He who denies his faith places himself on the side of the old Israel against Jesus himself (Acts 3:13f) and cannot expect to be accepted at the judgement.

But these words do not constitute any trace of rules of expulsion either.[267] First of all they are modified by the passages about Peter's denial and by Luke 12:10. There was clearly a denial of the Son of Man which could be forgiven. Not until the denial meant a voluntary and conscious repudiation of salvation could it be described as sin against the Holy Spirit and therefore unforgivable.[268] Secondly, none of these passages speak about expulsion from the earthly community. The deniers and apostates had themselves chosen to leave the circle of the believers. That which awaited them was not church disciplinary measures - but the final judgement.

The clearest of the "intolerant" synoptic passages is Mark 3:28f (=Matt. 12:31f; Luke 12:10). According to this passage there is one - and only one - sin which cannot be forgiven: blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. A person who blasphemes the Holy Spirit will be left without forgiveness, not only in this age, but also in the age to come (Matt. 12:32). A closer investigation shows however, that it is not a question here of a concrete act which can be described in outward terms.[269] To blaspheme against the Holy Spirit is not to commit an outward act, but to oppose the eschatological salvation which Christ reveals. In Matt. and Mark, where the passages are connected with the story of Beelzebub, it refers to a pattern from the exodus tradition, as E. Lövestam has shown. Jesus, like Moses, did signs with God's finger (=God's Spirit). The Pharisees were now hardening their hearts as Pharaoh had done. They would not acknowledge that it was God who was working in Christ, and by doing this they blasphemed the Spirit of God. Therefore in Mark and Matt. the words are directed against people who stood outside the community.[270]

On the other hand, Luke uses the words as a warning call to people within the Christian community. Neither here are any disciplinary measures implied, but we can expect that the words placed like that gave rise to the thought: What does it mean, concretely, that a member in the community blasphemes the Holy Spirit? More about this below.

M. Weise has tried to show that Matt. 5:22b reflects a primitive Christian devotion rite with equivalents in the Qumran texts.[271] The logion has afterwards been hung on to the antithesis in Matt. 5:21-22a, and that is why both its parts have often been understood as antithetical. But, says Weise, the two parts are of parallel content. They both speak of the same offence: A member in the church blasphemes Christ and the Holy Spirit by reviling his fellow-believer. The first part names the instance which, on behalf of the church, has to pass sentence: τὸ συνέδριον i.e. the church's council of elders, understood as an analogy of "the twelve". The other part names the place of punishment: the burning Gehennah.

The passages from the Manual which Weise brings forward as support (1QS II 4b-10; VIII 6b-7a) are hardly convincing parallels.[272] But Weise still has good reasons for his interpretation. The two lines have certainly been added on to the antithesis, the structure of which they disturb. Any marked difference between saying ῥακά and saying μωρέ to one's brother cannot be found. Several church fathers, like the Syriac Didascalia, have understood the passage in about the same way as Weise does. That συνέδριον can refer to a Christian council of elders is seen in Ignatius who throughout describes the twelve apostles as such. He also sees the church's council of elders as the heirs of the apostles.

But seeing κρίσις in Matt. 5:21 clearly refers to an official court of law, at least the one who put the words together ought to have meant that συνέδριον in v. 22b means the same. While Ignatius felt the need of giving the word a qualifier in order to avoid a misunderstanding,[273] the word here stands without a qualifier. And, even if it was the case that συνέδριον here denotes a Christian council of elders, it does not follow that this council should sentence the deviator to the fire of Gehennah. Therefore Weise's thesis is admittedly interesting and quite possible, but hardly probable.

On the other hand, Qumran can throw light on the text in another way. Foolish language, the grudge against and the reviling of a fellow-believer were considered in Qumran grounds for partial and temporary expulsion (1QS VII 4, 8f). Against this background it is clear that Matt. 5:21f presupposes a community with still more radical demands.[273a] He who thinks evil of and reviles his fellow-Christian is threatened - not with proportionate punishments of given duration - but with eternal fire. But if these demands were connected with actual sanctions is not stated.

In addition to Matt. 18:8-9[274] there is, however, one synoptic passage which seems to imply that certain offences demand an expulsion

procedure: Matt. 7:15-20. A comparison with the parallel passage in Luke (Luke 6:43-45) shows that both evangelists make use of the parable about the tree and the fruit in widely differing ways.[275] Luke has used the parable as an admonition to live according to the words of Jesus. Foremost in the passage stands Luke 6:43, which points out the impossibility of a good tree (= a Christian) bearing bad fruit (= evil deeds). The parable ends with an application (6:45) in plain language: a good person does what is good, a bad person what is bad. This leads on to an admonition to do as Jesus has said (6:46). What happens to the tree is, from Luke's point of view, less interesting and is not mentioned. Matthew, on the other hand, has used the parable to answer the question: How is one to recognize false prophets? The direct answer to the question: By their fruits you shall know them, is placed first and last in the passage (inclusio Matt. 7:16a, 20). By inserting 7:19 Matthew implies what will happen to the false prophets. The bad tree will be cut down and burned up (cf. Matt. 3:10).

Who are the false prophets? The term ψευδοπροφήτης can be used generally for Jewish preachers who wrongly give themselves out as speaking the word of God (Luke 6:26; Acts 13:6; 2 Pet. 2:1). It is quite possible that Jesus had warned against such. But as the words are used in Matt. they obviously have a more distinct meaning. Here it is a question of people who claim to be Christians. They come into the church from without (οἵτινες ἔρχονται πρὸς ὑμᾶς , 7:15), they agree with the Christian creed, they prophesy, drive out evil spirits and do miracles in the name of Jesus (7:21f).[276] With all this they will lead astray (πλανήσουσιν) the chosen ones (Matt. 24:11, 24; Mark 13:22). This situation is well known in the early Christian literature. We have detailed descriptions of such false prophets in Did. 11, 12 and Herm. Mand. XI. A characteristic feature is that they impoverish the church they are staying with. The false prophet orders forth food by invoking the spirit (Did. 11:9; Herm. Mand. XI 12), he says in the spirit, "Give me money" (Did. 11:12) and refuses to prophesy if he is not paid (Herm. Mand. XI 12). It is obviously such itinerant preachers that Matthew refers to. And when he calls them "ravenous wolves" he could be referring to their taking advantage of the church's hospitality.

Now, we have seen that Matthew in 18:8-9 gives us to understand that heretics, who lead other Christians astray, have to be expelled. It is then difficult not to see also in Matt. 7:19 an indication that false prophets should be expelled from the community.[277] But it is typical of Matthew that in both passages he avoids saying it outright. He makes use of traditional material, touches it up, and places it in a new context in order to bring out a new meaning in it.

(For the sake of completeness Mark 8:33 par should perhaps also be mentioned. The words of Jesus to Peter, "Away with you, Satan", of course does not mean expulsion from the community. But it expresses a

strong criticism which reminds one of it. Matthew has also by the addition σκάνδαλον εἶ ἐμοῦ (Matt. 16:23) pointed out that Peter's way of behaviour was a threat to the community. In an earlier stratum it is possible that Jesus' criticism was directed against his confession of the Messiah which was marked by nationalistic expectations.[278] But as the texts appear now, it is Peter's objection to Jesus' prediction of suffering which is the direct cause of the criticism. We can therefore refer this saying to the group of statements by Jesus which speak of suffering as a condition for taking part in the community (see above p. 164ff). The purpose of these words is not to give rules for membership, but to accentuate the need for making a decision. One must be able to sacrifice everything. The situation in Mark 8:33 is, however, so special that one for that reason alone should refrain from reading into the text anything about the limits of the community.)

Thus we find that the synoptics do not supply us with any explicit rules which indicate which deviations lead to expulsion. Matt. 18:15-17 does admittedly constitute a formal rule of expulsion, but it does not state what offences it applies to. It states only that when all reprovings have failed, one has to declare that the impenitent one has left the community.

We also find that the synoptics, even indirectly, practically throughout refrain from suggesting what kinds of behaviour make it impossible for a member to remain in the community. Only in Matt. 7:19 and 18:8-9 do we find traditional material used in such a way that it gives expulsion as a sanction if a member is a false prophet or if a person causes others to fall.

We have mentioned a number of synoptic passages where the Jesus fellowship is presented as difficult to attain to and extremely exacting - but without disciplinary measures being indicated. One particular problem is how these words are to be reconciled with the programmatic words about the openness of the Jesus fellowship. Seeing this question is connected with the theological motifs, we will return to it later.

2. Paul[279]

First let us remind ourselves of what we found in our analysis of the passages by Paul. In 2 Thess. 3:6-15 Paul threatens "the undisciplined ones" with expulsion. This lack of discipline expressed itself in that they did not work for their food. But that which was serious about their offence was that they set themselves up against the regulations Paul had imposed (see above p. 135).

We found in 1 Cor. 5:1-5 that Paul, with a devotional formula surrenders a man to Satan and thus also expels him from the community. The man's offence consisted of a long and ostentatious indecent sexual

relationship. By his behaviour he had given expression to views which were alien to the essence of the community.

We also found (1 Cor. 5:9-13) that Paul exhorts the community in Corinth to avoid such Christians as were guilty of fornication and other serious sins: covetousness, idolatry, blasphemy, drunkenness, robbery. Apparently these sins were considered as indications of an oppositional libertinism.

In a further four passages in the epistles of Paul we find expulsion connected with certain specified transgressions.

In Rom. 16:17 Paul exhorts his readers to keep an eye on (σκοπεῖν) and turn away from (ἐκκλίνετε ἀπό) those persons who cause controversies (διχοστασίας) and scandals (σκάνδαλα) which could lead away from the teaching they have acquired. What the punishment actually consists of, we will return to. Here we will only note the fact that, as in Matt. 18:8-9, it is a question of heretics who bring about or preach (P^{46}) seduction. Paul describes them furthermore as follows: They do not serve Christ, which they clearly pretend to do, but they serve their own belly and seduce the hearts of the innocents by their fair speech (χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας).[280]

1 Cor. 16:22: "If anyone does not love the Lord, let him be outcast." From the solemn concluding formulations in 1 Cor. 16 some scholars have tried to construct a primitive Christian order of service.[281] In this way the curse of v. 22 has been understood as an expulsion formula, intended for the exclusion from the sacrament of those who are unworthy, at the beginning of the service. The motives for this hypothesis have, however, been derived from later texts (Didache, Justin). In any case, the formula in v. 22 can scarcely have functioned as a basis for an expulsion procedure. It gives no observable criterion as to who was to leave the service. Did. 9:4 lays down that only those who are baptized were allowed to partake of the eucharist. But if the same rule applied in Corinth, then at least v. 22 does not give an apt picture of those who are not baptized - would not the catechumenes love the Lord? The prayer for the Lord's return which concludes v. 22, gives added weight to the curse,[282] while it at the same time makes it clear that the effect of the curse is the Lord's matter and not the community's As a contrast to the curse, there follows a blessing (v. 23) on the recipients of the letter. The antithesis indicates that those who "do not love the Lord" are people who are outside the community, not partakers in the service. But even if the curse refers to people present at the service, it does not need to be understood as an expulsion formula, but rather as a threatening admonition to self-examination.[283]

The curse in Gal. 1:8f is hypothetically formulated. It is directed against preachers who come into the community from outside with another gospel than that which the addressees had earlier accepted.

In 2 Cor. 12:20 - 13:2 Paul threatens members who have com-

mitted a number of specified offences, with disciplinary measures. The sins are enumerated in two "catalogues of vice", 2 Cor. 12:20: ἔρις, ζῆλος, θυμοί, ἐριθεῖαι, καταλαλιαί, ψιθυρισμοί, φυσιώσεις, ἀκαταστασίαι. 2 Cor. 12:21: ἀκαθαρσία, πορνεία, ἀσέλγεια.

The content in such catalogues of vices is usually stereotype.[284] But here Paul seems to have had the special conditions in Corinth in mind.[285] In the first list he mentions sins which all have to do with dissensions (first four "inward" sins, then four "outward" sins).[286] In the second list we find sins of fornication. Dissension and fornication were two of the big problems in Corinth, or two sides of the same problem.

It is, however, not the occurrence of such sins in themselves which worries Paul. He is afraid that those who have committed these sins have not repented (μὴ μετανοησάντων). It is this impenitence which could force Paul to take disciplinary measures.

Thus we find in Paul's writings that certain sins are clearly specified as being reasons for expulsion in one form or other. Expulsion can fall upon those who set themselves up against the way of life and regulations which Paul had preached (1 Cor. 5:1-5; 2 Thess. 3:6-15), heretics who cause others to fall (Rom. 16:17) or preachers who come from outside with a different gospel from the one Paul had preached (Gal. 1:8f). We find too that serious moral sins can lead to partial expulsion (1 Cor. 5:9-13) or other disciplinary measures (2 Cor. 12:20 - 13:2). In the former case, the sins were probably connected with a demonstrative repudiation of Paul's preaching. In the latter case it was rather the unrepentance than the sins themselves which made measures necessary.

3. Other New Testament Writings

a. Acts

Two passages in Acts describe an expulsion procedure: Acts 5:1-11 and Acts 8:18-24. Both passages are chiefly in the form of anecdotes, and in both, the charismatic features dominate rather than the legal. Even if these stories do not give us any formal rules of expulsion, they can tell us which norms the author of Acts highly valued.

Acts 5:1-11. Taken from its context, the story of Ananias and Sapphira constitute an early Christian equivalent to the Old Testament story of Achan in Josh. 7.[287] Both stories warn against dealing deceitfully with such as is dedicated to God.[288]

In the present context the story serves a more precise purpose. In Acts 4:32-35 the koinonia of the church is described, in which particular

stress is laid on the economic unity.[289] There reigned in the church such a spirit of fellowship that they were all of one heart and one soul, and that they served each other with their property.[290] Then as illustrations of this fellowship there follow two stories. One is about Barnabas who fulfilled the requirements of the fellowship and sold his property (4:36f). The other is about Ananias and Sapphira who broke the sincere koinonia which was characteristic of the church.[291]

1QS VI 24f prescribes, in a similar way, that he who lies on the question of property is to be expelled from the Purity for a year. As we saw, this introduces a whole series of rules of expulsion, all with the aim of protecting the sect, היחד, its purity and authority.[292] The similarity is striking, but there are also important differences:

In 1QS VI 24ff judicial rules are given, aimed at regulating the administration of justice within the sect; in Acts 5:1-11 an anecdote is given which is intended to underline the importance of the koinonia of the church. In 1QS VI 24f a carefully gradated punishment is given: partial and temporary expulsion; in Acts 5:1-11 the punishment is radical and immediate: the guilty ones fall down dead without a trial or evidence from witnesses.[293] Even the concepts of the nature of the offence are different. The offences enumerated in 1QS VI 24ff are throughout directed against the holiness of the sect. Acts 5:3, 4 and 9 qualify the crime in another way: It is a lie against the Holy Spirit, a lie - not against men but against God, it is putting the Spirit of the Lord to the test.

Also Simon's offence in Acts 8:18-24 is described as a sin against the Holy Spirit. Impressed by the miracles done by the apostles, Simon wanted to acquire the Spirit and the power to pass on the Spirit to others. Peter replies with a couple of powerful curse formulas: "Your money go with you to damnation!" "You have no part or lot in this!"

One can wonder whether the description of the offences of Ananias, Sapphira and Simon is connected with Luke's version of the words of Jesus about blasphemy against the Spirit.[294] In Mark (3:28f) and Matt. (12:31f) the words are connected with the Beelzebub episode. There, to blaspheme the Holy Spirit is to oppose God's eschatological act of salvation.[295] Luke puts these words in a context of his own. He associates them with the words about confessing and denying (Luke 12:8f) and with the promise of the Spirit's help in times of persecution (v. 11f). Here the Spirit is not only a sudden power which expresses itself in wonders and miracles. It is something essential for the community, a gift of God, which is characteristic of all confessors.[296] The sin against the Holy Spirit thus gets its own nuance. It does not consist only of rejecting the eschatological work of salvation as made effective by the Spirit, but it is more a matter of setting oneself up against the Holy Spirit which is effective in the church.[297] While Matt. and Mark direct the words against people outside of the community, Pharisees and scribes, who did not apprehend the arrival of God's kingdom in the miracles of Jesus,

Luke lets the words act as a warning call to people within the community. But understood in this way, the words must have led to the question: What does it mean that a member in the community blasphemes the Spirit? The two stories in Acts answer the question,[298] Acts 5:1-11 by describing how Ananias and Sapphira "deceived the Holy Spirit", "put the Spirit of the Lord to the test", and Acts 8:18-24 by portraying how Simon wanted to buy, make himself lord over, the Spirit which, by means of the laying on the hands by the apostles was given to the church.[299]

b. The Johannine Literature

As far as 1 John 5:16-17 is concerned we found that the author takes up a traditional term "sin unto death" and uses it to denote open apostasy from the sphere of eternal life, conscious and intentional cutting off of the living communion with God and Christ. In such cases one does not pray for the sinner seeing one cannot expect it to have any effect.

In "the letters to the churches" in the Book of Revelation we found a more tense situation. On the one hand the letters are characterized by zeal which is directed against the internal and external enemies of the community. On the other hand, we find that this zeal has not influenced the expulsion procedure. Disciplinary measures are implied, but direct exhortations to expel members are missing.

A few other Johannine passages on the whole bear out the picture.

John 15:1-8 takes up the same illustration of the tree and the fruit,[300] as in Matt. 7:15-20 and Luke 6:43-45, but uses it in a different way. The tree, the vine, is now not the individual Christian but Christ himself, and the different branches are the disciples. The interest is centred round the fact that a branch must be joined to the trunk in order to bear fruit, while, on the other hand, a branch which does not bear fruit, is taken away. This means that the disciples have to "remain"[301] in Christ, i.e. let the words of Christ remain in them, if they are to "bear much fruit". This shows itself in that the word cleanses them (v. 2f) and that they can pray for what they want and get it (v. 8). On the other hand: If a disciple does not have the word of Christ in him, then he does not bear any fruit either, i.e. he is not cleansed by the word and cannot partake in effective prayer.[302] The result is declared to be that he is "thrown out" (v. 6).[303] It would be a bit too hasty to here assume a concrete expulsion procedure. The passage is characterized by the same dialectic which we found in 1 John. Within the community there is effective prayer, and cleansing from sin can take place. But he who refuses to accept this cleansing, has by so doing left the community of his own accord. This apostasy is described drastically in 1 John as "sin unto death" and in John 15 as someone being "thrown out". John 6:37 expresses the same somewhat contradictory thought tersely: "The man

who comes to me I will never throw out". No definite deviation causes expulsion. But, to not come, or to leave the Christian community, that is to be "thrown out".

2 John 10f warns against preachers who come from without into the community and do not have the right teaching, i.e. "the doctrine of Christ" (v. 9). The expression "doctrine of Christ" can be understood as either the doctrine about Christ - the heretics in question denied the incarnation (v. 7) - or as that doctrine which Jesus Christ himself taught.[304] "Doctrine" included also "evil deeds", which those who received the heretic became participants in. That is why one was not allowed to receive or greet such people.

3 John testifies of the same situation, so to say from the other side. Because the letter is so brief, it has been possible to interpret it in widely differing ways.[305] It is, however, clear that a leader in the community, Diotrephes, took some travelling preachers to be heretics and refused to receive them. This time the author of the letter is on the side of the travelling preachers and complains about the reception they got. From our point of view there are two things of particular interest. First of all we find here for the first time stated that not only the travelling preachers but also those members who received them as guests, were expelled from the community (ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκβάλλει).[306] We find the cause of this expressed in 2 John 11. He who greets a heretic,[307] partakes of his evil deeds (κοινωνεῖ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ τοῖς πονηροῖς). Secondly, the letter reflects a conflict between two church leaders who both claim the right to personally practise church discipline. The writer of the letter promises to take disciplinary measures himself against Diotrephes when he comes to the community. The writer will "bring up the things he has done", i.e. his evil slander and his action against the preachers. The situation reminds one of 2 Cor. 13:1, where Paul threatens to use church discipline when he comes. But Paul attacks the whole community, not one leader who claims a personal exercise of power. The deeper causes of the measures in 3 John are uncertain. Does the conflict reflect a development in church organisation (A. Harnack)? A struggle for power between an archbishop and his bishop (B. H. Streeter)? Is the presbyter fighting against a gnostic bishop (W. Bauer)? Or is he himself a gnostic who is excommunicated by the orthodox Diotrephes (E. Käsemann)?

Thus in the Johannine literature[308] we find that open apostasy from the living communion with God and Christ can be denoted as "sin unto death" which one does not need to pray for (1 John 5), and can be described as someone being "thrown out" of the community (John 15). We found furthermore instructions that travelling preachers should be tested with reference to their teaching and life, and that they should be turned away if they did not come up to the standard (2 John 10f; Rev. 2:2). Those who receive such heretics can be expelled (3 John). Finally,

disciplinary measures (not necessarily of the nature of expulsion) are directed against heretics within the community (Rev. 2:14-16, 20) and even against a powerful local church leader (3 John).

c. The Pastoral Letters

In 1 Tim. 1:18-20 the writer tells that he has consigned Hymenaeus and Alexander to Satan. Hymenaeus is also mentioned in 2 Tim. 2:17 together with Philetus. The smith Alexander is cursed in 2 Tim. 4:14. It is clearly a question of advocates for a gnostic line. They have "made shipwreck of their faith" (1 Tim. 1:19), they have set themselves up against the preaching of the apostle (2 Tim. 4:15), they have perverted the faith of a few people (2 Tim. 2:18). The writer denotes their offence as blasphemy (1 Tim. 1:20). We have more detailed descriptions of these heretics in for example 1 Tim. 4:1-3 and 2 Tim. 3:1-9,[309] where Timothy is also exhorted to keep clear of them (2 Tim. 3:5). Titus 3:10-11 gives the same answer to the question of who will be effected by the punishment of expulsion: those who spread heresy.

d. Hebrews

Hebr. by its rejection of repentance after baptism, has a unique position among the NT writings.[310] This hard attitude does not take an unimportant place in the periphery of the theology of Hebr. either. Several of the main thoughts in Hebr. can in actual fact be seen as arguments for the thought that an apostate cannot become reconciled.[311] It is, however, doubtful if this means that a sinner must be expelled from the religious community. In 6:4-8 it tells of the impossibility of leading an apostate back to renewed repentance.[312] 10:26-31 speaks of the hard judgement which shall one day fall on those who "wilfully persist in sin after receiving the knowledge of the truth". Obviously this refers to people who have themselves renounced their membership in the community (cf. 10:25) and who can now only await the final judgement (6:8; 10:27). The context and the choice of words refer principally to the synoptic words about confessing and denying and to the words about the sin against the Holy Spirit. It is a question of open, intentional and voluntary (ἑκουσίως) apostasy. There is no recommending of measures from the community's side.

Hebr. 12:15 can seem to be exhorting the community to exclude unsuitable members: "Look to it that there is no one among you who forfeits the grace of God, no bitter, noxious weed growing up to poison the whole". The words allude to Deut. 29:17 where idol worship is threatened with the covenant curses.[313] However, the context shows

that the verse does not directly refer to expulsions, but rather to a general exhortation to watchfulness. The recipients of the letter must, according to the main clause in v. 14 "aim at peace with all men, and a holy life". This will come about by their paying attention to (ἐπισκοποῦντες) three things: that no-one (μή τις) lacks the grace of God, that no (μή τις) poisonous root grows up and that no-one (μή τις) is immoral or unholy. As with the two surrounding phrases so the middle phrase can also be interpreted as an exhortation to maintain a high spiritual and moral standard in the community. To read into it an exhortation to expulsion would be to press the text too hard. This is almost the same as in the letters of the Book of Revelation where we find on the one hand powerful ethical exhortations and on the other hand restraint on the question of direct expulsion measures.

4. Conclusion

The information in the NT concerning which transgressions lead to expulsion, can be divided into three groups.

In the first group we find statements with the meaning that one must expel "heretics", i.e. people who actively make propaganda for another doctrine or way of life than that which each different New Testament writer stands for (Matt. 18:8-9; Rom. 16:17; 2 Thess. 3:6-15; 1 Tim. 1:18-20; 2 Tim. 3:5; 4:14; Titus 3:10f; Rev. 2:14-16, 20). The many exhortations to try the preachers who come from outside into the community and to turn away those who do not come up to the standard, is a special case (Matt. 7:19; Gal. 1:8f; 2 John 10; 3 John 10; Rev. 2:2). In one text, 3 John 10, we found that also those people who had fellowship with these heretics could be expelled - but this way of dealing was also criticized by the writer of the letter.

In the second group we find statements which amount to that only those who themselves consciously and voluntarily leave the community are to be considered as expelled. Here there is no express information given as to which concrete deviations are to be judged as open apostasy. There are different characteristics given of a person who deviates in this way. He does not want to listen (Matt. 18:15-17), he blasphemes the Spirit (Luke 12:10), he does not remain in Christ (John 15:1-8), he commits sin unto death (1 John 5:16-17), he has apostatized (Hebr. 6:4-8) and sinned of his own free will (Hebr. 10:26-31). In these cases it is difficult to draw the line between resigning one's membership and being expelled. The community can indicate what has happened by a formal decision (Matt. 18:15-17), or by ceasing to pray for the person concerned (1 John 5:16-17). But it can also happen that the apostasy does not need to be indicated at all. There is only a warning that this can happen (Hebr. 6:4-8; 10:26-31). This type of statement is limited to the synoptics, the Johannine literature and the letter to the Hebrews.

In the third group we find statements indicating that certain serious sins can lead to expulsion. Aside from Acts, which in anecdotal form gives examples of sin against the Spirit (5:1-11; 8:18-24), it is only Paul who gives such instruction. But in these cases the deviation is qualified, either as oppositional libertinism (1 Cor. 5) or by the sinner's impenitence (2 Cor. 12:20 - 13:2).

The statements in the first group must be understood from the angle of necessity of unity in the organized church. The statements in the third group are of the kind which in the long run are natural for a community which places ethical requirements on its members. But how is the second group of statements to be understood? Here strong ethical demands are united with a striking restraint as far as disciplinary measures are concerned. These texts are not "tolerant" towards deviation from the norms of the community. But they seem to place the responsibility for a person's belonging to the community wholly on the individual himself. In any case these texts are a sharp contrast to the detailed rules of expulsion in Qumran. We shall see later how they can be understood as expressions for a definite theological motif.

C. How was Expulsion Carried Out?

1. The Synoptic Gospels

In Matt. 18:15-17 we found a rule of expulsion which had been in operation in a Greek-speaking Jewish-Christian milieu. The procedure is formalized, the course of action which is described is intended to be followed in every case of serious deviation. The rule amounts to this that the guilty one is reproved, first privately, then with witnesses. If the deviator does not even accept the correction before the whole community, he is declared as no longer belonging to it. One could say that the community, rather than expelling the deviator, is verifying that he, by his impenitence has himself stepped beyond the limit of the community. In the formation of the rule, Lev. 19:17 and Deut. 19:15 are combined in a way which is analogous to the Qumran texts.

We found that the rule originally intended definite and total expulsion, and that sentence should be passed by the local community as a whole. But Matthew, by working in the tradition into a suitable context, has given another representation of the procedure. According to the evangelist, expulsion was not definite, because the one who was expelled could always return. And we found that the community's authority to judge should, according to Matthew, be executed by its leaders. The judgement

was a sacral one which was passed prayerfully and in the certainty that it would one day be ratified in heaven. However, even the evangelist seems to imply (as in Matt. 7:19 and in 18:8-9) that the expulsion was total.

2. Paul

In 2 Cor. 13:1-2 we found traces of the rule that repeated reprovings must take place before more formal disciplinary measures can be taken. There Paul brings together different testimonies in a way which is strongly reminiscent of CD.

In 2 Thess. 3:6-15 we found several formal features which are analogous with the Qumran texts, particularly CD. If the reproving does not help, the guilty one is to be noted down. Fellowship with him at meals has to cease, and possible other sensitive relations are to be cut off. But the offender is not to be totally expelled. One is to continue to reprove him in the hope that he will return. The community as a whole has to make decisions in these matters.

In 1 Cor. 5:1-5 we found a much more vehement form of expulsion, a formal devotion, taken by the community and the apostle together. The actual judgement act has a liturgical character, possibly making use of a baptismal formula. In any case, it is seen as a sacral act in which the risen Lord takes part. The devotion entails the total expulsion of the sinner from the community.

Finally, in 1 Cor. 5:9-13 we once again found instructions about partial expulsion. Remarkably enough, the prohibition against having dealings with sinners only applied to the internal relationships of the Christians.

The picture we have got can be filled out by still further Pauline passages.

Partial expulsion on a low formal level is recommended in Rom. 16:17.[314] Paul admonishes the recipients of the letter to keep an eye on (σκοπεῖν) heretics and to turn away from them (ἐκκλίνετε ἀπ' αὐτῶν).

Σκοπέω is used about watching in a positive (Philip. 3:12) as well as a negative meaning. Ἐκκλίνω is used generally about avoiding someone or something. A parallel which also throws light on the current theological motif for such an informal, partial dissociation is Ecclesiasticus 22:13: The foolish one is not to be visited or spoken much with, or you may "find yourself bespattered when he shakes himself". P^{46}, A, D, G, and others formulate Rom. 16:17 more definitely (ἐκκλίνατε , aorist, P^{46} asyndetic). Possibly in this shape the expression implies a more formal expulsion procedure.

In 2 Cor. 2:1-11; 7:8-12 Paul deals with a disciplinary case in

Corinth. Unfortunately, Paul's tactfulness prevents him from speaking outright in plain language. The question as to what offence the deviator had committed can only be answered by guesses. The only thing that is clear is that it is matter of an action which had inflicted damage on another member (2 Cor. 7:12) and which could even be conceived as hurting Paul (2 Cor. 2:5, 10).[315] Because of this and Paul's mild attitude, one nowadays usually assumes that the case is different from the one in 1 Cor. 5.[316] Nor is the nature of the sanction clear. Doskocil interprets ἐπιτιμία (2:6) as an informal brotherly reproving,[317] Windisch and Poschmann as total expulsion.[318] Both views are probably wrong. Seeing that the sanction was to be cancelled formally (χυρῶσαι , 2:8), it should have been enacted formally. The expression ὑπὸ τῶν πλειόνων (2:6) seems also to refer to a unanimous decision by the community as a whole.[319] Paul writes that the community, by the punishment, has preserved its purity (7:11), which probably means that it had dissociated itself from the sinner. But it is implied at the same time, that the community still has contact with the one who is punished. The punishment is enough - now he is to be met with love and forgiveness (2:8, 10). The formulations indicate without doubt a definite sanction: formal, partial, temporary expulsion.

In Gal. 6:1 we come across an admonition to reprove[320] that brother who was caught in sin. The reproving was to be done with mildness and restraint, because one should bear one another's burdens and examine oneself. The Jewish community ideal, with its emphasis on brotherly, mutually loving treatment, is beautifully expressed here.

Eph. 5:8-11, like Matt. 7:15-20 and John 15:1-8,[321] takes up the illustration of the tree and the fruit. In the beginning the illustration is used in about the same way as in Matt. It is a matter of testing and deciding "what would please the Lord" and of not having fellowship with the barren deeds of darkness. Paul qualifies it thus: μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐλέγχετε . What is one to ἐλέγχειν ? Seeing "deeds" is the nearest preceding noun, one has presumed it to be the object and translated ἐλέγχετε by "show up", "expose".[322] But αὐτῶν in v. 12 shows that the author is thinking of those who commit the deeds. It is likely therefore that ἐλέγχειν has a personal object and alludes to the brotherly reproving.[323] In that case the text seems to imply some form of partial expulsion. The reproving meant on the one hand, that one did not fully identify oneself with the sinner, and on the other hand, that one continued to maintain a certain relationship with him. There is, however, no question of a formal judicial procedure.

In 1 Cor. 6:1-11 Paul criticizes the Corinthians for going to pagan lawcourts with their disputes.[324] He refers to the Jewish thought that in the last day the righteous will judge the Gentiles.[325] From this the Corinthians were to draw the conclusion that they should not allow those who are considered to be inferior, i.e. the pagans, to be judges over

them.[326] Paul asks: "Is there no wise man among you who would be able to judge between his brethren?" (v. 5).

This section indicates that the taking over of legal forms by the early church was far from being without problems. Paul here pleads for a Christian judicial system of their own - be it on a modest plane. The Corinthians on the other hand seem to have thought it was unnecessary or perhaps outright unsuitable for the church to build up its own legal forms.[327]

Now, these evidences of an early Christian judicial system, refer to the settling of disputes between church members. As far as we are concerned the question is whether such a judicial system was used in cases of expulsion. It does not seem likely that such a case could be decided by means of a "wise man" being appointed to judge. In 1 Cor. 5, instead, the whole community has as its duty to thrust out the fornicator with a solemn devotion. 1 Cor. 6:1-11 can therefore not be used to answer the question: what instance was to decide on expulsion. But the passage does show that Paul considered the judgement of the community as neither a solely charismatic nor a solely judicial activity. He rather saw in it a manifestation of the church's participation in Christ's task to judge the world.[328]

Thus Paul lays great weight on the fact that deviating Christians are to be met with repeated reprovings. These reprovings are put into effect on a low formal level. They constitute a natural part of the brotherly community's normal pattern of life.

If the reproving does not help, it can for Paul become a question of more formal measures which, however, are to be taken by the community as a whole. In serious cases Paul can resort to the vehement charismatic devotion. But what is most striking is that partial expulsion plays such a role. We have seen that these very partial expulsions were made a system of in Qumran, and that the Jewish ban probably acted as a partial expulsion from the Pharisaic fellowships in the time of Paul. It is clear that when Paul uses partial expulsion he is linking on to disciplinary methods in the surrounding Jewish world.

From where, more exactly, has Paul taken the method of partially expelling a deviator? From Qumran or from Pharisaism? Even if we, in certain details, have found agreement between Qumran and Paul (see particularly pp. 133f, 137ff), it is not likely that Paul was influenced by Qumran. On the other hand, Paul has during his time as a Pharisee, learned a certain practice of how to come to grips with deviating members. Most likely he has made use of this practice when he was faced with disciplinary problems in the young Christian church. The parallels with Qumran are probably most easily explained by the source situation. We are fortunate to be able to have at our disposal detailed documents from the Qumran Sect. But equally good documents from the Pharisaic fellowships are missing.

3. Other New Testament Writings

a. Acts

The two passages in Acts which deal with expulsion (Acts 5:1-11; 8:18-24, see above p. 172ff), because of their literary genre, cannot be expected to give any exact information about the expulsion procedure. It should be observed that in both cases it is Peter alone who acts and that the expulsion and the threatened expulsion, respectively, in both cases take the form of a charismatic act; in Ch. 5 an immediate judgement of God, and in Ch. 8 a curse. These two features express the idea one had at the time it was written of how Peter acted - hardly more.

There is, however, one feature in the story about Simon which can go back to a concrete custom. According to 8:24, Simon directs a request to Peter and John to pray for him in order that the effects of the curse will not appear. K. Stendahl has pointed out a primitive Christian pattern in which prayer - forgiveness - "almighty prayer" are mutually determined by each other.[329] In Matt. 18:19-20 the two witnesses in v. 16 appear as praying on behalf of the deviator one had expelled that, if possible, he will be reunited with the community. In Mark 11:25 prayer is connected to mutual forgiveness and to the forgiveness of God. In John 15 we find in a similar way, cleansing (v. 2f) and effective prayer (v. 7, admittedly not expressly prayer on behalf of another) in connection with expulsion from the community. In 1 John 5:16 prayer for a sinner is the normal way to reunite him with the community. James 5:15-20, finally, brings home the importance of the duty to pray for those who have sinned and who have "strayed from the truth". Such prayer will be effective. Prayer on behalf of those who in one way or another have left the community, is thus an oft recurring theme. It is therefore likely that Acts 8:24 is reflecting a concrete custom. If the person expelled wanted to come back, the community was to pray for him, and it was thought that prayer nullified the most powerful curse.

b. The Johannine Literature

As we have seen, Rev. 2:2 speaks of testing those who call themselves apostles. Even 2 John 10f and 3 John 10 imply that preachers who arrive at the community are to be tested. We are here given quite a striking picture of how one dealt with a travelling preacher who did not pass the test. He was not to be received into the house, i.e. that hospitality which an apostle or missionary otherwise could claim, was to be denied him. He was not even to be met with salutation of peace (cf. Matt. 10:11ff). Both sanctions have as we have seen (p. 100f), equivalents in the rabbinic traditions about the ban.

We found that 1 John 5:16 did not - as is sometimes supposed - recommend differentiation between mild and serious sins. On the other hand it is clear that an assessment was made of the sinner's attitude. If the prognosis was good, one should pray for him and "grant him life". If he was assessed as impenitent, such prayer was considered to be meaningless.

One interesting thing is that 3 John describes a case in which a church leader has taken on himself the right to alone decide about expulsion. This has parallels only in the "pastoral letters", and contributed to the author's somewhat sarcastic description of the church leader, "he who wants to be foremost", ὁ φιλοπρωτεύων (v. 9).

In the Johannine literature there is no reference to reproving as a part of the expulsion procedure.[330] Nor is there anything which indicates partial expulsion.

c. The Pastoral Letters

The devotion in 1 Tim. 1:20 takes up a formulation from 1 Cor. 5:5, παραδίδωμι τῷ σατανᾷ .[331] However, there are significant differences between the passages which deal just with the practice of the expulsion. a) The writer says that he pronounced the curse alone; any help from the community is not mentioned. b) The persons in question are mentioned by name, a thing which Paul always avoids, usually by the use of the word τοιοῦτος "such a person".[332] c) In both passages the curse is said to serve a good purpose; but while the possibility of salvation is, in 1 Cor. 5, to take place in "the day of the Lord", the writer of 1 Tim. seems to hope that the one who is cursed will soon better himself (ἵνα παιδευθῶσιν μὴ βλασφημεῖν). d) The two passages have a different tone and style: in 1 Cor. 5 an indignant, linguistically obscure, zealous devotion; in 1 Tim. 1 a sober, clear and cold assertion. The charismatic formula has paled. One knew that Paul could use it, but in the contemporary church discipline it was not a reality.

Titus 3:10 and 1 Tim. 5:19f presumably give a more reliable picture of conditions during the time of the pastoral letters. Titus is admonished to turn away a heretical person after the first and the second warning (νουθεσία). As in Matt. 18:15-17, the mode of procedure is formalized, and is to be followed each time a heretic appears. But unlike Matt. 18, Titus 3 mentions no witnesses and no community. It is Titus himself, by virtue of his office (cf. Titus 2:15), who reproves and judges.

Timothy is told not to accept an accusation against any of the "elders" without two or three witnesses. Once again we find, as in Matt. 18:15-17 (and 2 Cor. 13:1), a reference to Deut. 19:15, though more brief. But here the witnesses do not have to warn and reprove, as was the case in Matt. The matter was far too delicate for private complaints

to be given space. It is always easiest to reprove lower down in the hierarchy. In later text traditions the reference to witnesses has even been cut out, because of which "the elders" appeared to be juridically immune. But most likely the reference should remain. The witnesses have the formal duty to strengthen the truth of the accusation. If the accused really has sinned, Timothy himself is to reprove him (ἔλεγχε) before all - presumably the rest of the elders.

It is more difficult to know whether the following verses (1 Tim. 5:21f) give us further information about the expulsion procedure. V. 21 is a powerful exhortation to impartiality. The exhortation is made before "God and Christ and the angels who are his chosen", an expression which is reminiscent of how Matt. 18 binds together the earthly community with the "heavenly Father", "the kingdom of heaven", "heaven", where the angels of the little ones stand before the face of the Father. But how is v. 22 to be understood? "Do not be hasty in the laying on of hands, nor participate in another man's sins; keep yourself pure." Is it as in 1 Tim. 4:14 and 2 Tim. 1:6 (Acts 6:6; 13:3) a question of that laying on of hands which took place at an ordination to office? In that case the meaning should be that Timothy was not to ordain anyone as elder without careful examination of the person.[333] Or, does it refer to that laying on of hands which took place when a person was accepted into the community (Acts 8:17f; 19:6; Hebr. 6:2)? Then entrance into the community should be preceded by an examination, a regulation which was followed both in Qumran and by the Pharisees and which is possibly supported in Jude 22.[334] Or does the verse give a regulation for how sinners and heretics who had been expelled, can be received back into the community? In this case the exhortation to carefulness becomes very precise.[335] But in view of the parallels in 1 Tim. 4:14 and 2 Tim. 1:6 and the context in 1 Tim. 5, the first alternative seems to be the most likely. In other words, verse 22 has nothing to do with expulsion or re-entry.

d. James

In a way which seems strange for readers today, physical sickness and sins are connected with each other in James 5:13-20. First three different life situations are given (Is anyone suffering? Is anyone glad? Is anyone ill?) and then the way one should behave in each case. In the last case, sickness, the elders of the community are to be called to pray and anoint the sick one with oil. At this the sick one will be healed "and any sins he may have committed will be forgiven". In v. 16 the recipients are exhorted to confess their sins and pray for each other, and the result of this is given as being that they will be healed (ὅπως ἰαθῆτε).[336] Confession of sin is mentioned in the NT in connection with baptism and conversion (Matt. 3:6; Mark 1:5) but also as a recurring feature of the Christian life

(Acts 19:18; 1 John 1:9). Very soon the confession of sin was given a regular place in the Christian worship as a preparation for prayer (Did. 4:14) and for communion (Did. 14:1).[337] But to here describe confession of sin as a "liturgical act" must be misleading.[338] It is a non-ritual manifestation of the open-hearted brotherly fellowship. The effectiveness of prayer for others is illustrated by an example from Elijah (v. 17). After this the whole letter is concluded with an exhortation to convert the sinner who has strayed from the truth,[339] and thus save his soul from death.[340] The pattern of thought is about the same as in Matt. 18, where the emphasis also lies on "winning back" the brother who has been led astray (πλανηθῇ, Matt. 18:12; James 5:19). "Rescuing his soul from death" reminds one of 1 John 5:16f where the addressees are exhorted to "grant life" to that brother who has sinned, by prayer on his behalf.

Thus the passage presupposes that errors can lead to "death", which certainly implies that the guilty one leaves the community. But all the weight lies on the side of efforts to save, by means of confession and prayer on his behalf, the one who has gone astray.

e. Jude

Jude 22f seems to urge the taking of measures against those who have fallen a victim to the preaching of heretics.[341] The text is extremely uncertain. One has first to choose between the two-part (P^{72}, B, C^*, Sy ph, Cl, Hier etc.) and the three-part (ℵ, A etc.) form of the text, and then between a series of different variants.[342] What all the texts have in common is that they assign different behaviour towards different groups within the community. If, as C.A.Albin and others assume, B affords the right form, it is a question of two different groups. Both these should be shown compassion, though in different ways.[343] The people in the first group are characterized by their being διακρινομένοι. This verb with many meanings is used in v. 9 with the meaning of "dispute". Therefore it is very likely that here also the word denotes struggle, even if it is a person's inner struggle. Such people who struggle with themselves one is to - "snatch them from the flames". One is also to be compassionate to the people in the second group, yet on a less complaisant way. They are to be treated with fear, and one is to hate "even the garment spotted by the flesh". The latter expression does not need to refer to other than the misdeeds of the sinners. Unclean clothes are spoken of in this symbolic meaning in Zech. 3:2ff, a passage which evidently lies behind Jude 22f. But since the aim of v. 23b must be to describe another behaviour than that which is directed against the first group, it is more reasonable to see the word as an exhortation to concrete measures against the sinners. Then we have here still another

example of informal, partial dissociation. These people who have fallen for the heresy are to be met with compassion, but at the same time it is necessary to be restrained in the matter of contacts with them (cf. 2 Thess. 3:15; Gal. 6:1; Eph. 5:11).

4. Conclusion

The NT texts reveal little interest for defining expulsion procedures. We found no uniform terminology and only a few rules which were meant to be followed whenever the question of expulsion came up (Matt. 18:15-17; 1 Tim. 5:19f; Titus 3:10). The introduction of a Christian judicial system was at times fundamentally opposed (1 Cor. 6:1-11).

We found evidence for reproving as a part in the expulsion procedure in Matt. 18, Paul's letters, and the pastoral letters, but, on the other hand, not in Acts or the Johannine literature. In connection with the reproving we found certain parallels with the Qumran texts. As in Qumran, the rule for reproving was formulated in reference to Lev. 19:17 (Matt. 18:15-17). As in Qumran reprovings/evidences from different occasions could be added together so that Deut. 19:15 was fulfilled and expulsion became possible (2 Cor. 13:1). As in Qumran, people who had been reproved were to be noted down (2 Thess. 3:14). And, as in Qumran (CD), even a person who had been expelled from the community, had to be reproved (2 Thess. 3:15).

The judicial instance was, according to Paul, the community as a whole. However, the charismatic judgements in Acts 5 and 8 were passed by Peter alone, and in 1 Tim. 1 by Paul. The rest of the pastoral letters present the bishop as alone responsible for the expulsion procedure. We found a similar development in Matt. 18. The rule in vs. 15-17, taken by itself, places the duty to judge on the whole community. But the redaction of the evangelist places the authority on to the leaders of the church.

As a rule, expulsion seems to have been temporary. Admittedly the punishment on Ananias and Sapphira was irrevocable, but the text about it (Acts 5:1-11) is far too anecdotal to give sure information. The rule in Matt. 18:15-17, taken by itself, implied definite expulsion, but the evangelist alters this by his redaction. The devotion in 1 Cor. 5 was assumed to endure until the day of the Lord. But 2 Cor. 2 indicates that even according to Paul, expulsion could be revoked.

But what is most striking is that partial expulsions played such an important part for Paul, while elsewhere it does not assume any important place. It seems clear that Paul has applied Jewish (probably Pharisaic) disciplinary methods to the Christian church.

Otherwise expulsion seems to have been considered as total. One cut off all contacts, considered the person concerned as outside the group.

denied him hospitality, and no longer greeted him with the salutation of peace. But if he repented and wanted to return, the community's prayers on his behalf could annul the expulsion.

The New Testament information about the expulsion procedure is not detailed enough for a development to be described. We must take into account that local differences were great, and that the instructions of the New Testament writers were not always representative of the true conditions in the communities. But we can infer a few features in the development.

Firstly, the charismatic feature seems gradually to have paled. In 1 Cor. 5:5 we find an early vehement devotion in the original. The judgements of God in Acts 5 and 8 are both placed in the early period of the church and are both connected with Peter. The curse in 1 Tim. 1:20 is put into the mouth of Paul but has lost its primitive power.

Secondly, the community's collective responsibility on the expulsion question seems gradually to have been transferred to individual officers. We see in 3 John that this process did not take place without opposition.

Thirdly, the formalizing of the expulsion procedure seems to have taken place by the taking over of Jewish judicial forms. The need for reprovings, the number and role of witnesses, the Pauline partial expulsion, the Johannine phrase "sin unto death", all these features have been taken over from the Jewish tradition and adapted for Christian use.[344]

D. Which Theological Motifs were Connected with Expulsion?

1. The Synoptic Gospels

a. The Holiness Motif

Naturally enough the aim here is not to discuss the concept of holiness in the NT or in the synoptics.[345] We will only inquire into whether the thought of the community's holiness was connected with expulsion of an offending member, as we saw was the case in the OT, in Qumran and in the Pharisaic fellowships.

In Matt. 18:1-4 we found a clear polemic point against that form of holiness concept which dominated expulsion rules in Qumran. When Jesus brought forward a child as an example, it was, according

to Matthew, a programmatic act, a fundamental explanation of how the basic structure of the Christian community was to be shaped. The hierarchy was turned upside down, order of rank was denied when the first became the last and the least greatest.

We found also that Matthew, by his redaction of Ch. 18, displaced the central point of the rule in vs. 15-17 so that less importance was laid on the actual expulsion, and more weight was laid on the searching out of the ones who had gone astray. But vs. 15-17, even when separated from their context, do not refer to the thought of the community's holiness as a motivation for expulsion.[346]

In certain of the synoptic texts, which presented the Jesus fellowship as exclusive, we found thoughts related to the holiness motif (Mark 6:11 par; 7:27 par; Matt. 7:6; 10:11; see above p. 166f), but these thoughts are never connected with disciplinary measures against members of the Jesus fellowship.

The presentation by the synoptics of the Jesus fellowship is instead rather provoking for those who want to connect the limits of the community with the motif of holiness. No carefulness about unclean contacts is to be seen. Jesus had constant contact with unclean people and sinners. Here the contrast to the religious communities in Qumran and rabbinic Judaism is strong. As "the friend of toll-collectors and sinners" Jesus would have been the first to be expelled from Qumran or the Pharisaic fellowships.[347]

b. The Covenant Motif

The covenant motif does not seem to have played an important role in the formation of the limits of the community either, according to the synoptics.[348] There are, however, in this context, features which are reminiscent of the Old Testament covenant motif. In the OT covenant texts it is stressed that the people expressly give their approval to the covenant (Ex. 19:8; 24:3; Deut. 26:18; Josh. 24:16, 22, 24). Admittedly the people acted collectively, but in principle they stood face to face with a real choice between life and death, blessing and cursing (Deut. 30:15, 19). Participation was voluntary. We have seen how this voluntariness was in Qumran applied to the individual's entry into the sect.[349] The restraint of the synoptic gospels about disciplinary instructions and their emphasis of the individual's own choice remind one of this feature of the covenant motif.

We have also seen that the theme "sin - forgiveness" is connected with the Old Testament covenant motif and to a certain extent influences the rules of membership in Qumran.[350] We find the same theme in Matt. 18. Here Matt. 18 is more consistent in relation to Qumran. While 1QS II 25 - III 12 prescribe humble penitence and ritual cleansings in order

that an apostate can once again be grafted into the community, Matt. 18 assumes that obedience is enough, forgiveness is enough and unlimited. But any express reference to the covenant motif appears neither in Matt. 18 or elsewhere in synoptic texts which are of relevance to us. One can only speak of a certain similarity.

c. The Motif of the Kingdom of God

If now neither the motif of holiness nor of the covenant played any decisive role in the formation of community limits in the synoptic gospels, which motif then was decisive?

All the features which we found to be characteristic of the synoptic presentation can be explained by the thought of the coming of the kingdom of God.

1. According the synoptics, the fact that the kingdom of God was near meant salvation and grace. The message about this was one of joy. The kingdom was now offered to all, even to those who were traditionally placed low down on the scale: children (Mark 10:14ff par; Matt. 11:25 par; 18:3), women (Mark 1:29ff par; 5:34ff; Luke 10:42), pagans (Matt. 8:10ff), toll-collectors (Luke 19:1ff; Mark 2:14), sinners (Mark 2:15; Luke 7:47; 23:43). Since the kingdom of God was characterized by grace, the Jesus fellowship came to be marked by grace, openness, willingness to receive and forgive.

2. That the kingdom of God was near, also meant a need for decision. People who had been reached by the message, but who did not accept it or did not put the kingdom above all else, had by this passed sentence on themselves (Mark 6:11 par; 10:21 par; Matt. 10:37 par; Luke 9:61f). In such situations the conception of holiness could be used but more as a secondary illustration than as a guiding motif. This need for a decision at the prospect of the coming kingdom of God explains the "intolerant" feature in the Jesus fellowship. Only he who puts aside everything else is "fit for the kingdom of God" and can enter into the Jesus fellowship (Luke 9:62). Because of this there is no trace of partial expulsion in the synoptics either. In the same way as one cannot partially join the kingdom of God, one cannot be expelled partially from the Christian community either.

3. By the demand for total commitment to the kingdom of God, superficial criteria for membership and status became meaningless. The ritual commandments have to give way to the demand for deeper devotion. By the proposition that it is not that which enters into a man which defiles him, but rather that which comes from within (Mark 7:15), Jesus knocks away the basis for any community structure built on ritual holiness. That is why Jesus criticizes, according to the synoptics, the idea of a hierarchy within the circle of disciples and shows in word and

act that the idea of the holiness of the community must not decide where the limits of the community are to be drawn.

4. Finally, the idea of the nearness of the kingdom of God explains the unwillingness of the synoptics to give definite offences as reasons for expulsion. Soon (but not yet) man is to be judged. One has to reconcile oneself with one's opponent before the trial begins (Luke 12:57-59 par).[351] Man is not to anticipate the judgement of God (Matt. 13:24-30), but should be more concerned about his own failings than other people's (Matt. 7:3-5 par). A maxim which has echoes in several places in the NT is this: "Pass no judgement, and you will not be judged" (Matt. 7:1).[352]

Both the tension between openness and reserve in the picture of the Jesus fellowship which the synoptics give, and the anti-hierarchical structure and the unwillingness to specify which deviations disqualified a member, can be seen as expressions for the idea that the kingdom of God is near at hand. Therefore "tolerant" and "intolerant" are inadequate alternatives for that community the synoptics describe. The Jesus fellowship was neither the one nor the other. On the one hand its norms were stronger and stricter than those of other groups. On the other hand it seems as if, according to the synoptics, it was preferably left to the individual to decide on which side of the boundary he was to stand.

But in Matthew we see that this uniform picture is beginning to be broken up. For the sake of "the little ones" it was now necessary that false prophets were turned away and heretics expelled. The relationship between the kingdom of heaven and the earthly community now came to be described in such a way that the church has authority to pass judgement which is effective in heaven.

Thus for the synoptics as a whole it applies that the motif of the kingdom of God decides the way in which the limits of the religious community are drawn up. By the radical rejection of the motif of holiness in this connection, the presentation of the synoptics differs from the rest of the NT as well as from the contemporary Jewish texts. Seeing that soon after the death and resurrection of Jesus the preaching about the kingdom of God was transformed, the overall concept of the community limits in the synoptics must date back to the circle round the historic Jesus.

The synoptic texts have certainly undergone a long and complicated tradition process. But even at the end of this process they give an astonishingly uniform picture of the community's limits. If our presentation above is correct, the synoptics have, in spite of the growth, transformation and re-interpretation of the traditions, been able to preserve a faithful picture, from this point of view, of the distinctive nature of the community round Jesus.

2. Paul

The idea of the holiness of the community occupies a quite different place in the writings of Paul than it does in the synoptics.

Paul has taken over the expression "the holy ones" as a designation of Christians, particularly the members in the primitive church.[353] Those who belong to the church are sanctified by Christ, chosen and holy (e.g. 1 Cor. 1:2). But Paul makes use of the holiness motif in a somewhat contradictory way. We have seen that in 1 Cor. 5:6-8 he revises a liturgical text and with its help expresses how the church has passed over from the context of the flesh to that of the spirit (p. 147ff). In Paul's additions to the text, the emphasis lies on the Christian's personal endeavour to ethically realize his new life. But at the same time, the taking over of the ritual formulation implies the influence of the motif of holiness: It is a matter of weeding out that which is evil, if the whole community is not to be contaminated.

This tension is characteristic of Paul. On the one hand he can use cultic expressions to describe how a person comes into the faith (Rom. 15:16). On the other hand he can conceive the holiness of the Christian to be so massive, that it was thought that by close contact it could pass over to other people who actually did not belong to the community (1 Cor. 7:14).[354] On the one hand Paul can declare that nothing is unclean (Rom. 14:14), and that the Christian has unlimited freedom to enter into such sensitive relationships as fellowship at meals (1 Cor. 10:27), and that the Christian has no obligation to avoid pagans, however immoral they may be (1 Cor. 5:10). On the other hand he maintains in the same breath, that if anyone counts anything as unclean, then it is unclean for him (Rom. 14:14), that one cannot sit at table with both the Lord and with demons (1 Cor. 10:21), and that one is not to eat with brethren who deviate (1 Cor. 5:11).

On the one hand it is clear that for Paul, the motif of holiness was connected with the church discipline. We have seen that partial expulsions, which were characteristic of the holy groups in the surrounding world, were typical of Paul. We have seen how the idea of the purity of the community came into play in the admonitions in 1 Cor. 5. And we have seen that when the community had taken the step of expulsion Paul could say in a commendatory way, that they had asserted their purity (2 Cor. 7:11).

2 Cor. 6:14 - 7:1, a passage which, with a bit of touching up, could have had its place in the Qumran writings,[355] describes the limits of the community in reference to fervour for purity in a particularly striking way. The dualism which is here developed has its equivalents almost throughout in Qumran. The illustration of the community as a temple is given in Qumran.[356] The obligation to dissociate oneself from those who are outside the community has parallels in Qumran.[357]

Belial is mentioned only here in the NT, often in Qumran, otherwise almost only in texts closely related to Qumran. Finally, the two opposites "flesh" - "spirit" are used in a non-Pauline way.[358] Furthermore seeing that 2 Cor. 7:2 follows on perfectly to 6:13, while the text in between breaks the line of thought, a very likely conclusion is that we have here an interpolation.[359] Even as such, it is interesting, as it shows that in certain Christian circles one came to draw the limit of the community in a way analogous to Qumran - i.e. with reference to the motif of holiness.

Even apart from 2 Cor. 6:14 - 7:1 it is still clear that the thought of the holiness of the church was connected with Paul's instructions about expulsion.

But on the other hand, the holiness motif is balanced with other ideas, as it is elsewhere in the writings of Paul. The holiness motif does not have the same effect on expulsion as in Qumran. We find few casuistics, no detailed punishment clauses, nothing about the yearly examinations and the moving up or down by degrees. This seems to depend on the following circumstances.

Firstly, solicitude for the individual plays a decisive role with Paul - as in Matt. 18. Paul lays the greatest of weight on reproving, on attempts to win back the individual sinner. And if an expulsion has to take place, in spite of everything, it too takes place with compassion for the individual, for the offender himself. The aim of the partial expulsion is, according to 2 Thess. 3:14, that the sinner will "be ashamed", i.e. will be led back to the regulations which reign in the church. Even the devotion in 1 Cor. 5 has at the end a positive aim for the offender.

Secondly, Paul's concept of holiness is ethical, not ritual.[360] It is the serious sins against the commandments given at creation that can pollute a person, and force the community to take sanctions, and not as in Qumran, ritual offences - inattention during a liturgical service, the breaking of the sabbath, contact with unclean or disciplinary offences.[361]

Thirdly, even in Paul the idea was effective, that he who judges his neighbour is taking over God's work. We have seen that this thought in 1 Cor. 5:9-13 in a remarkable way modifies the striving for a pure community.[362] In Rom. 2:1 the idea is expressed in a way which reminds one of Matt. 7:1 (he who judges others will himself be judged). In 1 Cor. 4:5 the Corinthians are warned not to judge Paul "before the time" (πρὸ καιροῦ),[363] before the Lord comes to judge. And in Rom. 14 the idea is developed exhaustively. Seeing that all will stand before the judgement seat of God, no-one is to judge his brother on the question of clean or unclean food, says Paul, which among other things means, that no sanctions are to be taken against any brother on the grounds of uncleanness. The controlling principle is here again, solicitude for the individual. One is to judge in such a way that one does not cause one's brother to fall (τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ

σκάνδαλον, v. 13). To what extent these formulations come from the synoptic traditions is a question apart. The idea is in any case the same: man is to be judged soon, but not yet.

The effects of the holiness motif are thus softened by the influence of thoughts which we recognize from the synoptic material: solicitude for the individual, criticism of the ritual concept of holiness; judgement is to be left to God.

O. Michel has described the tension between, on the one hand the rule that the tares and the wheat are to grow together (Matt. 13:24-30), and on the other hand the rule that a little leaven leavens the whole dough (1 Cor. 5:6) as the real problem of church discipline.[364] From our point of view the tension can be described as follows. The synoptic presentation of the limits of the community is orientated from the motif of the kingdom of God, in polemics against community limits orientated from the holiness motif. But for Paul the community limits are orientated from the holiness motif. Yet we have seen how with Paul the effect of the holiness motif was modified by thoughts which are associated with the motif of the kingdom of God.

3. Other New Testament Writings

It is difficult to find any uniformity in the other NT writings as far as theological motifs connected with expulsion are concerned. In the same way as the outward procedure varied, so did also the conceptions one connected with it.

Only in Hebr. does the covenant motif seem to be connected with the limits of the community. According to Hebr. 6:4-8, he who falls away will be hit by a curse and he who remains in the community will meet with blessing, just as in Deut. 28. Intentional and voluntary apostasy[365] is described in Hebr. 10:26-31 as regarding the blood of the covenant as profane. He who commits this sin will be judged - not by the community but by God. With two quotations from Deut. 32 it is implied with what catastrophes God will punish him. In Hebr. 12:15ff the writer refers to Deut. 29:16f, the same text which 1QS II 11-17 makes use of for the "covenant agenda",[366] and warns the community against each "noxious weed growing up to poison the whole". Immediately after this is expounded how the "new covenant" is superior to the old (vs. 18-24). The passages do not speak about expulsion. But we see how the writer interprets the voluntary apostasy of a member with terms and Old Testament passages which belong to the thought of the covenant.

In the rest of the writings we find the holiness motif in connection with expulsion. When Diotrephes not only turns away the newly-arrived preachers but also expels those who received them into their homes (3 John 10), we get an illustration of the rule in 2 John 10f, which states

that those who receive a heretic become partakers (κοινωνεῖ) of his evil deeds. In the letters of Rev. there is a burning zeal for the purity of the church. The unworthy ones are those who have polluted their clothes (3:4). If our interpretation of Jude 22f is correct (p. 185f), this is also a case where the thought of the purity of the community is connected with instructions about partial expulsion. Finally, the pastoral letters make Paul exhort Timothy to keep himself clean from heretics (2 Tim. 2:21).

All over, the holiness motif is effective here, but never so consistently as in the Manual.[367] It is neutralized by those conceptions which belong to the motif of the kingdom of God and which we saw modified the holiness motif even in Paul. In the letters of Rev. the burning zeal is modified by the thought of the eschatological judgement. It is the exalted Christ who is to judge, and no great weight is laid on the sanctions of the church. The thought that one must not anticipate the judgement of God reappear in James 4:11f and 5:9 with formulations which echo Matt. 7:1. In Jude 22f the instructions about sanctions against offenders are furnished with repeated exhortations to compassion. Timothy is not only to keep himself pure from heretics, but is also to nurture the incalcitrants gently (2 Tim. 2:25f). And finally: We have seen that solicitude for the offender finds expression in the community's effective prayer on his behalf (Acts 8:24; 1 John 5:16; James 5:15-20).

Thus, in these writings the holiness motif is over and over again connected with expulsion, but throughout it is modified by conceptions which belong to the motif of the kingdom of God: solicitude for the individual; it is God who will judge.

The NT places different motifs and conceptions in connection with expulsion from the community. But the most striking difference exists between the synoptics on the one hand, where the motif of the kingdom of God is dominant and the holiness motif is radically prevented from influencing the limits of the community, and the rest of the NT on the other, where the holiness motif is accepted, though in a modified form.

If our assessment is correct, that the picture the synoptics give in this respect goes back to the circle around the historic Jesus, the question then is: What was the reason for the holiness motif beginning to be used in connection with expulsion?

The following four circumstances should have contributed to it.

1. The Christian church took over organisational forms from the surrounding Jewish world. We have especially found this illustrated in Paul's instructions about partial expulsion. Such a taking over must have appeared both natural and practical. But in these non-Christian groups the organisational forms were connected with the idea of a holy and pure community. When they were taken over by the Christians, a bit of the holiness theology was also taken over, or to be more exact: The tendencies towards the holiness theology which were there, were

strengthened and in their turn had a real influence on how the community drew up its limits. The organisational forms and the theological reflection mutually influenced each other.

2. In the same way the church took over liturgical forms. We have also seen examples of this. In 1 Cor. 5:6-8 we saw how the community had taken over the Jewish custom of clearing out leaven before Passover. We saw how Paul made use of the liturgical expressions connected to this for motivating measures for expulsion, and how by this means the thought of the community's holiness came to determine its limits.

3. In the early Christian catechetical instruction the idea of holiness played an important role. Presumably linking on to diaspora Jewish feelings an ethical instruction was developed which above all referred to Lev. 19.[368] One had to walk in holiness and purity and abstain from fornication and impurity. In this connection the community came to be thought of as a new Levitical community, a temple, a holy priesthood (1 Pet. 2:5). When members deviated from the norms of this instruction, it was very easy to connect the disciplinary methods with the holiness motif.

4. The most important circumstance ought nevertheless to be the change in the Christian community's view of itself which the events of the first Christian Easter gave rise to. The idea of the connection between the earthly community and the kingdom of God altered in such a way that the community's eschatological authorities were brought out. The risen Lord took part in the life of the primitive church. Therefore, the holiness of the coming kingdom was already now reflected in the earthly community, and its limits towards the world were to be guarded by judgements of a holy jurisdiction.

Notes to Chapter IV

1) W. G. Thompson, Advice. Among the rest of the literature on Matt. 18, other than commentaries one can note: W. Trilling, Israel, 106-123; W. Pesch, Matthäus; P. Bonnard, Composition; G. Bornkamm, Binde- und Lösegewalt.
2) W. G. Thompson, Advice, 244. For other arrangement suggestions, see Advice 2ff.
3) W. G. Thompson, Advice, 67f.
4) W. G. Thompson, Advice, 247: "The doctrinal statement about their freedom as sons (17, 26) makes the disciples wonder about the criterion for true greatness".
5) R. Walker, Heilsgeschichte, 101-103; A. N. Sherwin-White, Society, 126.
6) Cf. 1 Cor. 8-10. D. R. A. Hare, Persecution, 142.
7) Cf. W. G. Thompson, Advice, 70f.
8) W. G. Thompson, Advice, 187, 249.
9) W. G. Thompson, Advice, 203f, 225.
10) W. G. Thompson, Advice, 226f.
11) Thompson also wants to find echoes from 17:22, 23 and 25 in 18:34, 31 and 23, which is not convincing.
12) 1, 3, 4, 10 (bis), 14, 18 (bis), 19, 23, 35.
13) Matt. 19:12, 14, 21, 23. The word in v. 21 has parallels and in v. 14 and 23 analogues in Mark and Luke. That Matt. 18:35 concludes a literary unit is already clear from the formula in 19:1, καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους. Cf. Matt. 7:28; 11:1; 13:53; 26:1.
14) Cf. R. Bultmann, Geschichte, 152; H. Braun, Radikalismus II, 86 note 3. That "the little ones" originally had a literal meaning is, however, disputed by O. Michel, TWNT IV, 655 note 21.
15) See below p. 121-124.
16) J. Jeremias, Gleichnisse, 35ff.
17) W. Trilling, Israel, 106-110; W. Pesch, Matthäus, 18-21.
18) E. Klostermann, Matthäusevangelium, 21, sees in the fact that Matthew ignores the disciples' dispute a tendency to weaken that which could be to their disadvantage.
19) W. G. Thompson, Advice, 73f.
20) W. Trilling, Israel, 107 note 6. Cf. W. G. Thompson, Advice, 73 note 11.
21) Cf. W. G. Thompson, Advice, 74f note 22.
22) W. G. Thompson, Advice, 75f.
23) W. Trilling, Israel, 107.
24) J. Gnilka, Kirche, 51ff, equates the inner structure in Matthew's church with the structure in the Qumran Sect. Both groups were thought of as brotherhoods, both provided for the little ones, both practiced church discipline, and both urged, in connection with this, communal prayer. But we have seen that the brotherhood in Qumran was characterized by a hierarchical order; children were not a part of the inner holiest community. The process of discipline was not completely analogous with that in Matthew's church, and the prayer in 1QS VI 2f does not serve the same function as the prayer in Matt. 18:19f.
25) See Ch. II, p. 76.
26) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar I, 773.
27) Cf. P. Billerbeck, Kommentar I, 783f.
28) Cf. 1QS VI 4f.
29) Cf. the role of knowledge in Qumran. See Ch. II, p. 54. Material collected by H. Braun, Radikalismus I, 21 note 1.
30) W. Bauer, Wörterbuch, 1064.
31) Cf. J. Jeremias, Gleichnisse, 190.
32) Cf. H. Braun, Radikalismus II, 25f.
33) This interpretation is advocated by W. Trilling, Israel, 111.
34) This interpretation is advocated by W. G. Thompson, Advice, 116f.
35) This interpretation is advocated by W. Pesch, Matthäus, 27.
36) That the construction in Matt. 5:29 is understood in this way is made clear by the fact that the connection between vs. 28-29 is clearly drawn: v. 28 ... πᾶς ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα .... v. 29 ... εἰ δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ὁ δεξιὸς σκανδαλίζει σε. The person who is seduced is the object of the verb.
37) P. Bonnard, Composition, 134, presents the hypothesis that "the little ones who believe in me" (v. 6) are baptismal candidates who could be led astray by an exaggeratedly strict novitiate which perhaps was influenced by the Essenes. No solid reasons are given.
38) Matt. 13:41; 16:23; 18:7 (3 times); Luke 17:1.
39) G. Strecker, Weg, 223, brings forward the argument that the quotation is inserted by Matthew, because it is dependent on the LXX (cf. K. Stendahl, School, 138). But also v. 15 displays LXX terminology. If Matthew had added the quotation, it would be an intensification of the juridic character of the rule and a weakening of the brotherly solicitude. But such a redactional measure would conflict with the rest of Matthew's proceedings in Ch. 18. Also G. Barth, Gesätzesverständnis, 78, maintains that the quotation was added by Matthew.
40) Detailed information about the whole word group is found in H. Braun, Radikalismus II, 115 note 1 and W. G. Thompson, Advice, 177 note 4.
41) Here the word has the more special meaning, "fellow believer", "church member". Even this meaning is common to the NT and has its equivalents in the OT. Cf. J. Jeremias, Gleichnisse, 108 note 2; W. G. Thompson, Advice, 176f note 3.
42) Ἐλέγχω in the LXX stands nearly always for some form of יכח. In the hifil this word belongs to the OT legal language where it seems to undergo a change in meaning from "stipulate what is right" to

"reprove"; H. J. Boecker, Redeformen, 45-47. In the rabbinic literature the duty to reprove is developed exhaustively in reference to Lev. 19:17; P. Billerbeck, Kommentar I, 787-790. In the NT ἐλέγχω is used about correcting someone because of a sin he has committed, "jem seine Sünde vorhalten und ihn zur Umkehr Auffordern", F. Büchsel, TWNT II, 471. Such reproving can be carried out by God (Hebr. 12:5 = Prov. 3:11), by Christ (Rev. 3:19), by the Spirit (Joh. 16:8), by the conscience (Joh. 8:9 var. lect.), by "the light" (Joh. 3:20), by the law (James 2:9). Reproving can also be done by people as a sign of mutual concern and (particularly in the pastoral letters) as a formal procedure (cf. Ch. II, p. 48f): Matt. 18:15; 1 Tim. 5:20; 2 Tim. 4:2; Titus 1:9, 13; 2:15. Possibly also Eph. 5:11 (see below p. 180). Only in Jude 15 do we come across the meaning "punish", in reference to 1 Enoch 1:9.

43) A. H. Mc Neile, Matthew, 266; E. Klostermann, Matthäusevangelium, 150. Cf. however W. G. Thompson, Advice, 178f.

44) D. Daube, Judaism, 355ff, refers to the same shifts in meaning for hiśtakker in rabbinic literature.

45) In Matt. 18:17 in the sense "refuse to listen to", "disobey". Cf. LXX Isa. 65:12 and Tob. 3:4, where the word is used about disobedience to the call of God and to God's law, respectively. Cf. also παρακοή Rom. 5:19 (Adam's disobedience) and 2 Cor. 10:6 (disobedience in the community). In Mark 5:36 the word has the meaning "overhear", "hear something which was not meant for one's ears". In early mss. and in Luke 8:50 the text is revised from being offensive. Cf. G. Kittel, TWNT I, 224.

46) In the LXX ἐκκλησία stands for קהל or קהלה 70 times out of 74. For the discussion of ἐκκλησία see O. Linton, Problem, 138ff; K. L. Schmidt, Kirche; K. L. Schmidt, TWNT III, 502-539; O. Michel, Zeugnis, 5-17; R. Bultmann, Theologie. 40f.

47) W. Schrage, Ekklesia, shows that the LXX is not a sufficient explanation for the word ἐκκλησία as chosen by Christians. The word συναγωγή from the LXX could be more apt. Certainly the choice of the word took place in polemic against the Jewish synagogue. On the other hand Schrage is hardly right when he maintains that the designation was taken from the profane Greek and not from LXX.

48) K. L. Schmidt, TWNT III, 522ff. The question of the "genuineness" of Matt. 16:18 lies outside our subject. As far as 18:15-17 are concerned, it is inconceivable that Jesus would have pronounced these words. The reasons are summarized in L. Brun, Segen, 92. Also K. L. Schmidt, Kirche, 296, has the opinion that Matt. 18:15-17 constitute a kind of catechism for the church after Easter, and which was put into the mouth of Jesus.

49) O. Michel, Zeugnis, 10; C. H. Dodd, Matthew and Paul, 294f.

50) W. Trilling, Israel, 115. For ἐθνικός, see K. L. Schmidt, TWNT II, 366-370. For τελώνης, see C. Michel, TWNT VIII, 88-106; J. R. Donahue, Tax Collectors. See also below, p. 129.

51) Cf. R. Bultmann, Geschichte, 151; W. Trilling, Israel, 114. Further see W. G. Thompson, Advice, 233 note 125.

52) The reading ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς σέ in Matt. 18:15 has probably crept in from Luke 17:4.

53) In the NT μετανοέω is found in Matt.: 5 times; Mark: twice; Luke: 9 times; Acts: 5 times.

54) W. G. Thompson, Advice, 234f.

55) Similarly, G. Strecker, Weg, 203.

56) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar IV, 293-333.

57) R. Bohren, Kirchenzucht, 27. Also E. Kohlmeyer, Charisma, 2-8, sees an analogue to the Jewish ban in Matt. 18:15-17.

58) C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, See above, Ch. III.

59) W. Doskocil, Bann, 33f. J. M. Mignard, Discipline, 158, maintains that Matt. 18:17 does not indicate expulsion from the community, but only personal boycott. "The offender is put into the category of the Gentile and tax collector, but this is not necessarily synonymous with expulsion by the church." But the legal language of the rule and the quotation from the OT rule for witnesses shows that the community's decision was conceived as a juridically binding act. There is no doubt but that the decision implied expulsion from the community.

60) bBK 94b; O. Michel, TWNT VIII, 103.

61) See H. Braun, Qumran I, 38ff.

62) H. Braun, Qumran I, 39; II, 337.

63) Ch. II note 48.

64) Cf. H. Braun, Qumran I, 39: "Die enge Verwandtschaft zwischen der qumranischen und der bei Mt. bezeugten Disziplinregel wird um so deutlicher, als man erkennt: es fehlen rabbinische Parallelen."

65) See J. Jeremias, Quellenprobleme, 209-211, where the most important evidences are given: Sanh V 1, VIII 4, XII 8-9 (= Makk I 8-9), Tos Sanh XI 1-5 (431), bSanh 40b-41a. pSanh V 1, 22c, 53ff, Sifre Num. §113 to 15:33. Jeremias tries to show that this rule explains the duplications in Acts 4 and 5. They are intentional repetitions, occasioned by the duty to warn. See also H. v. Vliet, Testimony, 53f.

66) H. v. Vliet, Testimony, 54: "nowhere in the rabbinical literature in the case of warning reference is made to Lev. 19:17".

67) Does this mean that the members of that community which Matt. 18:15-17 speaks of, lived their daily, private lives in a legal and economic community, similar to the description in Acts 2:44f and 5:32 of the primitive church?

68) 1QS V 24 להוכיח
Lev. 19:17 הוכח תוכיח

69) 1QS V 25 רעהו
Lev. 19:17f אחיך, עמיתך, בני עמך, רעך
70) 1QS V 25 אהבת חסד
Lev. 19:18 אהבת
71) 1QS V 26 אל ישנאהו
Lev. 19:17 לא תשנא
72) 1QS V 26 לבבו
Lev. 19:17 בלבבך
73) 1QS V 26 יוכיחנו
Lev. 19:17 הוכח תוכיח
74) 1QS V 26 - VI ולוא ישא עליו עוון
Lev. 19:17 ולא תשא עליו חטא
75) 1QS VI 1 אל יביא ... דבר
Lev. 19:18 לא תקם
Deut. 19:15 לא יקום ... יקום דבר
76) 1QS VI 1 בתוכחה
Lev. 19:17 הוכח תוכיח
77) 1QS VI 1 לפני עדים
Deut. 19:15 על פי שני עדים

78) Ch. II, p. 48f.

79) For other halakic rules with similar constructions in Matt., see W. Trilling, Israel, 117. Nothing is said about the nature of the sin. P. Bonnard, Composition, 135, guesses that it is a question of sins of ignorance which new Christians made themselves guilty of before they had completed their baptismal instruction.

80) H. Thyen, Studien, 239, goes too far when he says that the rule, taken by itself, above all expresses concern for an esoteric community's purity.

81) O. Michel, Zeugnis, 67: "Sind nicht Heiden und Zöllner insonderheit berufen (Matth. 21, 32)?"

82) Even more so in Luke.

83) G. Bornkamm, Binde- und Lösegewalt, shows how Matt. 18 is formed in the tension between Hellenistic and Jewish-Christian traditions. We deal with the evangelist's redaction from a more restricted angle.

84) W. G. Thompson, Advice, 187. Cf. E. Billing, Närhet, 96-103, who however presupposes that the parable of the lost sheep and Matt. 18: 15-17 belonged together already in Jesus' teaching.

85) W. G. Thompson, Advice, 157.

86) F. Büchsel, TWNT II, 59f.

87) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar I, 738f. Cf. W. Doskocil, Bann, 36f; J. E. Mignard, Discipline, 160f; W. G. Thompson, Advice, 190.

88) J. Jeremias, TWNT III, 751.

89) J. Jeremias, TWNT III, 750. Against L. Brun, Segen, 100.

90) W. G. Thompson, Advice, 192f, gives still another usage: A man can

"loose" or "bind" his wife by the promises she gave without his knowledge (Ps.-Jonathan Num. 30:6, 9, 13).

91) B. Gerhardsson, Nycklamakten, 60. R. Bohren, Kirchenzucht, 51ff, suggests that "bind" and "loose" in Matt. 16:19 aim at imprisoning and releasing demons. This strange interpretation isolates the word completely from Matt. 18:19.

92) H. Thyen, Studien, 240ff, 252f, maintains that the word came into being in the primitive church as an apocalyptic, prophetic legal phrase, by which the community, as a whole, is given the eschatological authority to forgive sins. In connection with the controversy between Peter and Paul in Antioch, the words were applied to Peter, which gave rise to Matt. 16:19; Studien, 231f.

93) K. Stendahl, Prayer, 78; School, 28.

94) 18:19, general promise of answer to prayer (cf. Matt. 7:7; Mark 11:24 etc.). 18:20, the Lord's divine presence in the church (cf. Ab III 2).

95) P. Bonnard, Composition, 135f, sees an even closer connection between v. 16 and v. 19f. He means to say that v. 19f does not refer to the community's decision but to the brotherly reproving. Thus Peter's question in v. 21 would be prepared for.

96) For another opinion, see R. Bohren, Kirchenzucht, 103f, and H. Campenhausen, Amt, 139.

97) W. G. Thompson, Advice, 233ff, points out that Matthew here throughout describes sin as guilt.

98) See J. Jeremias, TWNT III, 751, who, however, with Matt. 16:19 as a point of departure, speaks of the development as "die Ausdehnung der Binde- und Lösegewalt auf die Apostel". The relationship between the rule and the context in Matt. 18 imply a development in the opposite direction. For a summary of the arguments for the concept that "the disciples" in Matt. 18 means only the twelve, see J. Murphy-O'Connor, Péché, 186f.

99) B. Rigaux, Thessaloniciens, 710, thinks of vs. 6-15 as a postscript, caused by bad news from the church. Cf. ἀκούομεν v. 11.

100) Also 1 Thess. 4:1 can be given as parallel. Cf. B. Rigaux, Thessaloniciens, 133f.

101) It is not my job to take up this problem here. For literature I refer the reader to W. G. Kümmel, Einleitung, 179, 184, 409, and B. Rigaux, Thessaloniciens, XVIII-XXIII. I proceed from the idea that 2 Thess. was written by Paul after 1 Thess.

102) Thus A. Schlatter, Paulus, 675.

103) K. Stendahl, School, 138f.

104) See above, p. 49.

105) Schlatter, Allo and others, think that by this quotation Paul alludes to a coming trial with witnesses giving evidence. See H. Windisch, 2 Kor, ad loc. M. Delcor, Courts, 76, puts forward CD IX 16-23 as

a parallel to 2 Cor. 13:1-2 without seeing in what the parallel lies. Cf. also H. Strathmann, TWNT IV, 493f: "Die Stelle ist also ein Beispiel für die Sorglosigkeit, mit welcher der Apostel at. liche Schriftworte, ohne sich um ihren genauen Sinn zu kümmern, zu handhaben vermag, wie auch für die Sorglosigkeit der formalen Gedankenbewegung, der er sich bisweilen überlässt." Rather than being an example of "Sorglosigkeit" the passage seems to be an example of careful interpretation of the Law.

106) The words have been dealt with in detail by G. Milligan, Thessalonians, 152-154; J. H. Moulton-G. Milligan, Vocabulary, 89; M. Dibelius, Thessalonicher, 53f: B. Rigaux, Thessaloniciens, 582f, 704f. See also G. Delling, TWNT VIII, 48f; G. H. Giblin, Threat, 142ff.

107) POxy II 275:24ff and POxy IV 725:39ff. The texts are reproduced in M. Dibelius, Thessalonicher, 54.

108) G. Delling, TWNT VIII, 49.

109) Pesik, Ekhah p. 122b אסקסיא does not seem to give any clue. G. Dalman, Handwörterbuch, 14, translates it as "Unordnung", "Wildheit". M. Jastrow, Dictionary, 43, translates it "undisciplined, irregular troops".

110) Or "you have received", BG.

111) J. H. Moulton-G. Milligan, Vocabulary, 587f.

112) Cf. E. v. Dobschütz, Thessalonischer-Briefe, 310.

113) For Paul the Lord's command in this question (1 Cor. 9:14; cf. Luke 10:7) was not a duty but a right, from which one could abstain. His conduct has parallels in rabbinic literature; B. Gerhardsson, Memory, 186, 319.

114) See above all E. Käsemann, Legitimität. For the rabbis' obligation to work, see P. Billerbeck, Kommentar II, 745f.

115) Cf. A. Deissmann, Licht, 266.

116) G. W. H. Lampe, Discipline, 342, gets μηδὲ ἐσθιέτω to refer to expulsion from the communal meal. But the alternative here is "eat one's own bread" (v. 12) - "be a burden to others" (v. 8). Paul has commanded that no-one should be a burden to another. If a person does not want to care for himself, no-one else should care for him either.

117) Cf. Ecclesiasticus 3:23. For more examples see the commentaries. Cf. 1 Thess. 4:11. Cf. also W. F. Arndt-F. W. Gingrich, Lexicon, 652.

118) Thus E. v. Dobschütz, Thessalonicher-Briefe, 182; G. Milligan, Thessalonians, 73, 154; M. Dibelius, Thessalonicher, 56. On the other hand, B. Rigaux, Thessaloniciens, 709, stresses that the exhortation to work in quietness is found already in 1 Thess. B. Reicke, Diakonie, 243ff, maintains that the undisciplined ones anticipated the heavenly joy and freedom (cf. 2 Thess. 2:2) and allowed themselves to be entertained at private agape-meals.

119) Cf. G. H. Giblin, Threat, 143ff. A similar situation is described in Did. 12.

120) Luke 18:1; 2 Cor. 4:1, 16; Gal. 6:9; Eph. 3:13; 2 Thess. 3:13.

121) B. Rigaux, Thessaloniciens, 713.

122) H. G. Liddell - R. Scott, Lexicon, 1593f.

123) OGIS 629, 168; J. H. Moulton - G. Milligan, Vocabulary, 573.

124) G. W. H. Lampe, Lexicon, 1231f.

125) M. Dibelius, Thessalonicher, 55.

126) Μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι is in the better mss. subordinate to σημειοῦσθε and gives the purpose or content of the main word, a fact which further strengthens the interpretation "write down".

127) See above, Ch. II note 76. Cf. Josephus, Bellum II 122 (ἀναμείγνυμι). C. Rabin, Studies, 22ff. Cf. also Ezek. 20:18 LXX.

128) See below, p. 150.

129) See above, p. 48.

130) H. Lietzmann, Korinther, 22: "Ziemlich abrupt setzt ein neuer Abschnitt ein." H. Conzelmann, Korinther, 115, sees the connection in this that Paul is carrying on a theological polemic against a uniform line in Corinth which in Chs. 1-4 is documented under the theme "logos" and in Chs. 5-6 under the theme "bios".

131) W. Schmithals, Gnosis, 15, finds Ch. 5 and 6:1-11 to be united by the key-word κρίνειν and ascribes 6:12-20 to an earlier letter.

132) 4:6, 18f; 8:1; 13:4; cf. Col. 2:18.

133) H. Conzelmann, Korinther, 53, points out presence of a ring composition in 1 Cor. 1:18 - 3:23 and Rom. 5-8. Also 1 Cor. 5 seems to be arranged in a similar way.

134) Lev. 18:8; 20:12. Caius Instit. I 63. H. Conzelmann, Korinther, 116.

135) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar III, 353ff.

136) H. Odeberg, Korintierna, 85f.

137) A. Schlatter, Paulus, 170.

138) C. F. D. Moule, Idiom-Book, 91.

139) Corp. Inscr. Att. App., 108. A. Deissmann, Licht, 257.

140) W. Heitmüller, Namen, 88.

141) See tables in W. Heitmüller, Namen, 14f, 21ff.

142) Matt. 28:19; Acts 2:38 var. lect.; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5; 1 Cor. 1:13, 15.

143) Cf. C. H. Dodd, Matthew and Paul, 295f.

144) See above, p. 125f.

145) Admittedly, Paul has already judged (κέκρικα). But when he criticizes the community for not having driven out the offender he shows that it is the community who has the right to judge. Paul is only stepping in here because the community has been negligent. In a similar way Paul points out, in 6:1ff, the church's obligation to judge, which, however, can be exercised by a judge appointed for the purpose (6:5).

146) Greek Papyri in British Museum I, p. 75. A. Deissmann, Licht, 257. W. Popkes, Traditus, 93f.

147) H. Conzelmann, Korinther 118 note 37. W. Popkes, Traditus, 93. F. Büchsel, TWNT II, 172 note 4 gives a further couple of examples from the same period.

148) Cf. above, p. 22ff. For the pagan milieu see K. Latte, Recht, 61-88. At the very time of the NT the curse, as a sacral legal form, seems to have experienced a renaissance in Asia Minor. Cf. R. Kohlmeyer, Charisma, 10f.

149) B. Gerhardsson, Testing, 38ff.

150) Cf. also Acta Petri, Vercellenses 2 (E. Hennecke - W. Schneemelcher, Apokryphen II, 192): "Denn siehe, der Satan wird deinen Körper zerschlagen ---".

151) W. Foerster, TWNT VII, 161f. Cf. principally Rom. 16:20; Eph. 6:11; 1 Pet. 5:8.

152) The concept that the devotion should take the place of the expulsion the community had failed to carry out (Goguel, Kümmel, Odeberg), conflicts with the arrangement of the chapter. See particularly the programmatic 5:2b and 13b. Cf. B. Poschmann, Paenitentia, 27; J. Murphy - O'Connor, Péché, 169.

153) G. W. H. Lampe, Discipline, 350f; J. Cambier, Chair, 221-232. For interpretations by other church fathers, see B. Poschmann, Paenitentia, 27f.

154) H. Lietzmann, Korinther, 23; H. Conzelmann, Korinther, 118; E. Kohlmeyer, Charisma, 9.

155) R. Bultmann, Theologie, 209. Cf. A. Robertson - A. Plummer, Corinthians, 100.

156) H. Lietzmann, Korinther, 23.

157) It is not the intention here to deal with the whole of the complicated question of the meaning of "flesh" and "spirit" in Paul's wiritngs. For information about the problem, see O. Kuss, Römerbrief, 506-595; A. Sand, Fleisch, 3-121; E. Brandenburger, Fleisch, 7-22. For the following see principally E. Schweizer, TWNT VI, 425ff.

158) J. Cambier, Chair, 221. Cf. A. Sand, Fleisch, 143ff; J. Murphy - O'Connor, Péché, 170.

159) H. Campenhausen, Amt, 147 note 1, referring to G. Bornkamm.

160) E. Schweizer, TWNT VI, 434 note 691, objects that the reference to the day of the Lord would make the interpretation impossible, which is difficult to see.

161) E. Schweizer, TWNT VI, 434 note 691.

162) G. P. Wetter, Vergeltungsgedanke, 145ff.

163) Cf. also Acta Thomae 6 (E. Hennecke - W. Schneemelcher, Apokryphen II, 311): "Mein Gott wird dir in der zukünftigen Welt dies Unrecht vergeben, in dieser Welt aber wird er seine (strafende) Wunder zeigen".

164) E. Sjöberg, Gott, 169ff; E. Lohse, Märtyrer, 32ff.

165) Sifre on Num. 15:31 G. F. Moore, Judaism I, 547.

166) E. G. bBM 59a: Even the adulterer who is put to death, can have part in the age to come, seeing his death expiates his guilt. E. Lohse, Märtyrer, 42.

167) E. Lohse, Märtyrer, 38-43. Cf. W. Doskocil, Bann, 64 note 44.

168) The same thought is expressed by Plato, Aristotle and the Pythagoreans. See G. P. Wetter, Vergeltungsgedanke, 147f.

169) Baptismal exorcism in the form of a ritual driving out of the evil spirits and connected to the actual baptismal act itself, is first borne out in Acta Thomae (beginning of the 3rd century) and at the synod in Carthage (256). See F. J. Dölger, Taufexorzismus, 1-11. K. Thraede, RAC VII, 79-81, argues on behalf of a gnostic origin. However, alraedy earlier, baptism itself was considered to have an exorcistic effect. Also R. Bohren, Kirchenzucht, 110 note 131, here suggests an allusion to the baptismal act.

170) Cf. E. Käsemann, Sätze, 73: The handing over to Satan forms "ein Gegenstück zur Taufe".

171) Ex. 12:15-20. The regulations are collected in P. Billerbeck, Kommentar III, 359ff.

172) J. Jeremias, Abendmahlsworte, 51ff. H. Windisch, TWNT II, 904ff.

173) J. Jeremias, Abendmahlsworte, 51.

174) H. Windisch, TWNT II, 906f.

175) J. Jeremias, Abendmahlsworte, 53f.

176) H. Windisch, TWNT II, 905f.

177) Cf. 1 Cor. 3:16; 6:2f, 9, 15f, 18; 9:13, 24; 1 Thess. 2:1.

178) = Gal. 5:9. Can the phrase constitute a memory-text from Gamaliel's teaching? H. Windisch, TWNT II, 906 (Orla II 12).

179) In the NT only here and in 2 Tim. 2:21.

180) In the NT only here (4 times) and in Gal. 5:9 (= 1 Cor. 5:6b).

181) In Paul's writings found only here.

182) In Paul's writings only here and in 1 Cor. 10:20.

183) In the NT only here.

184) The preposition ἐν = ב, un-Greek. J. Jeremias, Abendmahlsworte, 54 note 2.

185) The word order is not Pauline. J. Jeremias, Abendmahlsworte, 54 note 1.

186) In the NT only in this section.

187) Cf. B. Lohse, Passafest, 101ff.

188) J. Jeremias, TWNT V, 902 note 54.

189) H. Conzelmann, Korinther, 119 note 46.

190) W. G. Kümmel, Korinther, 174.

191) H. Conzelmann, Korinther, 120 note 54: "Oben hiess es: Die Christen sind die ἅγιοι. Hier sind sie die mit ἅγιμα Versehenen."

192) H. Lietzmann, Korinther, 25; H. Conzelmann, Korinther, 120.

193) Cf. above p. 133f. Here, however, it is not the warning against the offence but the exhortation to informal sanctions which is repeated.

194) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar III, 36ff; A. Vögtle, Katalogen, 224 note 118. However, there was no absolute agreement on which the Adamic commandments were or on how many there were. W.D. Davies, Paul, 114ff.

195) It is of course not only a question of fellowship at meals during the community's own gatherings, but of every kind of fellowship at table. W.G. Kümmel, Korinther, 174.

196) Among the rabbis it applied that those who apostatized from the Jewish community were treated considerably more strictly than was a pagan.

197) B. Poschmann, Paenitentia, 36.

198) See above, pp. 26f, 30-32.

199) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar III, 362.

200) For a summary of the discussion see E. Haenchen, Literatur, 16f.

201) R. Bultmann, Analyse.

202) R. Bultmann, Redaktion.

203) R. Bultmann, Redaktion, 193.

204) R. Bultmann, Johannesbriefe, 56.

205) R. Bultmann, Redaktion, 194.

206) H. Windisch, Die katholischen Briefe, 136.

207) H. Preisker, in H. Windisch, Die katholischen Briefe, 168ff.

208) R. Schnackenburg, Johannesbriefe, 12f.

209) R. Schnackenburg, Johannesbriefe, 245.

210) Parallel formulations to 3:21f in 5:14 and to 3:9 in 5:18. Furthermore there are numerous terminological connections: ἀδελφός, ἁμαρτία, ζωή, κόσμος, ὁ πονηρός etc.

211) Lev. 4:27 unintentional: בשגגה LXX: ἀκουσίως
Num. 15:27 unintentional: בשגגה LXX: ἀκουσίως
15:30 intentional: ביד רמה LXX: ἐν χειρὶ ὑπερηφανίας
1QS VIII 17 intentional: ביד רמה
22 intentional: ביד רמה
deceitful: ברמיה
24 unintentional: בשגגה

212) Evidence in O. Michel, Hebräer, 233 note 3.

213) O. Michel, Hebräer, 234: "ἐκουσίως ἁμαρτάνειν und ἀποσθῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος werden identisch."

214) "Beware, lest thou shouldest walk in their ways/And tread in their paths,/And sin a sin unto death before the Most High God." R. H. Charles, Apocrypha II, 44.

215) "And it shall come to pass when thou becomest great,/And dost shake his yoke from off thy neck,/Thou shalt sin a complete sin unto death,/And thy seed shall be rooted out from under heaven." R. H. Charles, Apocrypha II, 54.

216) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar III, 779. Cf. also Num. 18:22 ἁμαρτία θανατηφόρος and Deut. 22:26 ἁμάρτημα θανάτου.

217) W.C. v. Unnik, Freedom, 468, 471.

218) R. Bultmann, Johannesbriefe, 88.

219) Or is God the subject? Cf. R. Schnackenburg, Johannesbriefe, 248; R. Bultmann, Johannesbriefe, 90 note 1.

220) Thus R. Bohren, Kirchenzucht, 100ff.

221) W. Nauck, Tradition, 145f, equates 1 John 5:16 with the Manual's command to hate apostates (1QS X 19-21). However, the difference is great. In the Manual: active spiteful dissociation. In 1 John: resigned passivity.

222) Cf. H. Windisch, Die katholischen Briefe, 135.

223) J. Herkenrath, Sünde, 135. W. Nauck, Tradition, 141f, comes with a different argumentation, but with a similar result.

224) "Keine briefliche Form, keine briefliche Situation, kein brieflicher Austausch ist in ihnen zu finden." E. Lohmeyer, Offenbarung, 37. For the discussion about the relationship of the "letters to the churches" to Rev. see W. Huss, Gemeinde, 30ff.

225) For the construction see B. Gerhardsson, Utsagorna, 72; W. Huss, Gemeinde, 41f.

226) W.G. Kümmel, Einleitung, 338ff. A. Feuillet, Apocalypse, 19ff.

227) E. Stauffer, Christus, 202.

228) 2:2, 9 var. lect., 13 var. lect., 19; 3:1, 8, 15.

229) H. Schlier, TWNT III, 144.

230) Mart. Polycarp. (12:2; 13:1; 17:2; 18:1) constitutes a drastic illustration of the antagonism between Christians and Jews in Smyrna in the 150's A.D.

231) The name Jezebel is probably a symbolic designation for a specific woman who acted as leader for a movement within the church. H. Odeberg, TWNT III, 218.

232) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar III, 771, 793.

233) There is possibly a linguistic connection between Balaam and Nicolaus. E. Lohmeyer, Offenbarung, 24. W. Huss, Gemeinde, 72ff. P. Janzon, Nikolaiterna, wants to explain the designation "Nicolaitans" from the Hebrew נכל, "act cunningly", a word which we come across in connection with the Balaam story (Num. 25:18)

234) A. Satake, Gemeindeordnung, 135ff.

235) Some manuscripts add σου after γυναῖκα. That is why one has seen in the "angel of the church" a bishop whose wife practised fornication. Hardly likely. With E. Lohmeyer, Offenbarung, 18, I understand the "angel of the church" to be a kind of heavenly "double" of the church, at the same time participating in and responsible for the life of the church.

236) Cf. A. Satake, Gemeindeordnung, 66.

237) See the critical apparatus.

238) R. H. Charles, Revelation I, 73f; W. Bousset, Offenbarung, 220; E. Lohmeyer, Offenbarung, 27.
239) M. Goguel, Église, 250.
240) R. H. Charles, Revelation I, 65. Also B. Poschmann, Paenitentia, 82.
241) B. Poschmann, Paenitentia, 83.
242) Cf. W. Huss, Gemeinde, 58.
243) M. Hengel, Zeloten, 181-188. For a temperamental summary of research see M. Smith, Zealots.
244) B. Gerhardsson, Utsagorna, 80f, 87-90.
245) K. Kohler, Zealots, 639f; M. Hengel, Zeloten, 151ff.
246) Ps. 106:29f; 1 Chron. 9:20; Ecclesiasticus 45:23-26; 1 Macc. 2:26.
247) M. Hengel, Zeloten, 155.
248) K. G. Kuhn, TWNT I, 521f.
249) M. Hengel, Zeloten, 165f (bSanh 106b).
250) M. Hengel, Zeloten, 167ff.
251) E. Stauffer, Christus, 161-214; B. Gerhardsson, Utsagorna, 80f.
252) Evidence in M. Hengel, Zeloten, 79ff.
253) F. Hauck, TWNT IV, 589.
254) M. Hengel, Zeloten, 266 (Josephus, Bellum VII 417ff).
255) Whether the punishment refers to the parousia or not is debated. Evidence for referring to the parousia is the use of ἔρχομαι and ἥξω respectively (2:5, 16, 25; 3:3, 11) and the illustration of the thief in 3:3. The conditional clauses (2:5, 16; 3:3) are evidence against this, as they give impenitence as a prerequisite for Christ's coming; also there are the temporal punishments in 2:22f. The question is perhaps of less importance seeing that both the present suffering and the final battle at Christ's coming belong to the eschatological events, according to the Book of Revelation.
256) W. Bousset, Offenbarung, 221; R. H. Charles, Revelation I. 74; O. Moe, Uppenbarelse, 110, maintain that 2:24 refers to the decree of the apostles in Acts 15. E. Lohmeyer, Offenbarung, 27, rejects the hypothesis and suggests that the formulation constitutes a contrast to the rules for how to live as found in Jezebel's circle. The verse is perhaps intended to modify that zeal which burns in 2:22f. Judgement belongs to God - not to the church.
257) ἐκκλησία
The Synoptics (229 pages): twice.
Acts, Rom., 1-2 Cor., Gal., Eph., Phil., Col., 1-2 Thess. (230 pages): 81 times.
ἀπόστολος

Synoptics: 8; Acts - 2 Thess.: 57.

προφήτης (as a designation of a Christian official)
Synoptics: 1; Acts - 2 Thess.: 12.

διδάσκαλος (as a designation of a Christian official)
Synoptics: 0; Acts - 2 Thess.: 4.

πρεσβύτερος (as a designation of a Christian official)
Synoptics: 0; Acts - 2 Thess.: 9.

ἐπίσκοπος (as a designation of a Christian official)
Synoptics: 0; Acts - 2 Thess.: 2.
258) Lamm 22b, bottom.
259) S. Lieberman, Greek, 80.
260) Observe the reading: ὅστις (= כל).
261) B. Sundkler, Jésus, 18, 28, has pointed out the connection with the general oriental idea of their own people being the navel, the centre of the world, towards which the rest of the peoples had to orientate themselves. The alternative particularism - universalism therefore does not fit here. Cf. J. Jeremias, Verheissung, 22f. R. Walker, Heilsgeschichte, 60ff, shows how Matthew intensifies the scheme of salvation history.
262) See above pp. 74ff, 88.
263) W. Foerster, TWNT I, 378f.
264) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar I, 571.
264a) Cf. L. Hartman, Testimonium, 68f.
265) Cf. R. Bultmann, Geschichte, 107 note 3.
266) In Ign. Eph. 7:1 it speaks of deviating Christians as "mad, fierce dogs", whom one must avoid. Not until here is it a question of measures of expulsion (partial and on a low formal level).
266a) This should apply even if W. D. Davies, Setting, 326, is right when he explains Matt. 7:6 as a "gemaric addition", which modifies Matt. 7:1ff.
267) G. W. H. Lampe, Discipline, 355f, sees these words as a direct answer to the question of what reason anyone could be considered as having forfeited his membership in the church.
268) E. Lövestam, Spiritus, 69ff, 79.
269) E. Lövestam, Spiritus, 49f et passim.
270) Cf. H. Thyen, Studien, 254.
271) M. Weise, Mt 5, 21f.
272) 1QS II 4b-10 constitutes a general cultic curse over those who stand outside the community - not a disciplinary sanction against deviators. That 1 QS VIII 6b-7a should refer to the collegium mentioned in VIII 1 is not at all sure; see above p. 51.
273) Ign. Magn. 6:1 συνέδριον τῶν ἀποστόλων
Ign. Philad. 8:1 συνέδριον τοῦ ἐπισκόπου
Ign. Trall. 3:1 συνέδριον θεοῦ
273a) Cf. W. D. Davies, Setting, 237f; J. E. Mignard, Discipline, 172f.
274) See above, p. 121ff.
275) Cf. R. Bultmann, Geschichte, 99.

276) C. Daniel, Prophètes, argues for the false prophets being Essenes. By presupposing that Jesus said these words in the Sermon on the Mount, Daniel has precluded himself from seeing Christian itinerant preachers in these false prophets. O. Böcher, Wölfe, has shown that the expression "sheep's clothing" is not purely metaphorical. Jewish, probably also Christian, prophets were dressed in sheepskins.

277) That the false prophets would be allowed to remain members of the community (thus H. Thyen, Studien, 240 note 7) is contradicted by the point of the parable: Prophets are to be tried by their deeds. What were these examinations to be for if not to form a basis for disciplinary measures?

278) See A. Meyer, Entstehung, 44; F. Hahn, Hoheitstitel, 226ff; E. Dinkler, Petrusbekenntnis, 142ff; E. Haenchen, Komposition, 81-96; H. Thyen, Studien, 218.

279) Here I count the following as letters by Paul: Rom., 1-2 Cor., Gal., Eph., Phil., Col., 1-2 Thess., Philemon.

280) Χρηστολογίας ought to have been pronounced as χριστολογίας Was Paul thinking of new teachings of Christology? L. G. Lönnermark, 95f.

281) H. Lietzmann, Messe, 236ff; G. Bornkamm, Ende, 123ff. Cf. C.-H. Hunzinger, Bannpraxis, 18; H. Conzelmann, Korinther, 359f.

282) L. Brun, Segen, 105f.

283) Cf. 1 Cor. 11:28.

284) A. Vögtle, Kataloge, 13, 116, 218.

285) A. Vögtle, Kataloge, 32; H. Lietzmann, Korinther, 160.

286) A. Vögtle, Kataloge, 15, 220.

287) There is a terminological connection in the unusual word ἐνοσφίσατο (v. 2f; cf. Josh. 7:1 LXX).

288) V. 4a conflicts with the depiction the summary in Acts 4:34 gives of holding of property in common, which shows that the story of Ananias and Sapphira had its own history and own point.

289) Luke is not thinking of a compulsory holding of property in common as in the Manual. Nor is this idea of communal property motivated by the purity of the community as in the Manual. See H. Braun, Qumran I, 143-149.

290) By this he fulfilled the fundamental commandment which according to Deut. 6:5 rested on the people of God. See B. Gerhardsson, Bemerkungen.

291) S. Brown, Apostasy, 99-107, has worked out how Luke by this carries on the line of thought for the poverty ideal which he depicted in the gospel. Brown's effort to see Ananias and Sapphira as an early Christian counterpart of Judas Ischariot is less convincing (106f).

292) J. Schmitt, Discipline, 100-107, has worked out the analogues between Acts 5:1-11 and the Qumran texts. Cf. to this H. Braun, Qumran I, 143-149.

293) K. Stendahl, Scrolls, 8. R. Bohren, Kirchenzucht, 25, 116, interprets Acts 5:1-11 as a formal ban. By this he starts, anachronistically, from late rabbinic traditions. To this see J. E. Mignard, Discipline, 180f.

294) S. Brown, Apostasy, 107-109.

295) E. Lövestam, Spiritus, 44ff, 56.

296) E. Schweizer, TWNT VI, 402ff. R. Bultmann, Theologie, 155ff.

297) Cf. E. Lövestam, Spiritus, 79f.

298) Cf. E. Lövestam, Spiritus, 49 note 99, where the author rejects the thought of a connection between Luke 12:10 and Acts 5:3, 9.

299) Acts 5:1-11 and 8:18-24 refer to the exodus tradition as do also the texts about "sin against the Holy Spirit". There are above all tones from Ps. 77 LXX:

1. ψεύδεσθαι (θεῷ)	Acts 5:3, 4 - Ps. 77:36.
2. πειράζειν (θεόν)	Acts 5:9 - Ps. 77:18, 41, 56.
3. καρδία as the seat of sin:	Acts 5:3, 4; 8:22 - Ps. 77:18,37,72.
4. Acts 8:21 = Ps. 77:37.	

300) See above p. 169.

301) Μένειν does not belong to the imagery part of the parable. The term is chosen for describing the disciples' actual relationship to Christ. J. Heise, Bleiben, 85.

302) Cf. J. Heise, Bleiben, 87f.

303) Ἐβλήθη ἔξω , Cf. ἐκβάλλειν Matt. 8:12 par; 21:12 par; 21:39 par; 22:13; 25:30; Luke 4:29; John 6:37; 9:34f; 3 John 10 etc.

304) R. Schnackenburg, Johannesbriefe, 280.

305) E. Haenchen, Literatur, 267ff.

306) Seeing Gaius had received the preachers and evidently eluded expulsion, R. Schnackenburg, Johannesbriefe, 293, assumes that κωλύει and ἐκβάλλει are presentia de conatu.

307) I.e. meet him with the salutation of peace. Cf. Matt. 10:13.

308) John 7:53 - 8:11 has a certain relevance for the assessing of church discipline because the text is missing from the oldest and best manuscripts. The reason seems to be that the text was considered to contradict the growing institution of penance. For an assessment of the limits of the Christian community during New Testament times the text has no relevance, however. The adulteress did not belong to the Jesus fellowship. See H. Riesenfeld, Adultera, 106-118; U. Becker, Ehebrecherin, 175ff.

309) Apparently the texts refer to a uniform heretical line which, by the writer of the pastoral letters, is placed in the future. See the excursus in M. Dibelius, Pastoralbriefe, 41ff.

310) The call to repentance, and the threat of punishment for those who do not accept the call to repentance, admittedly appear also in the

rest of the NT (Matt. 11:20ff; Acts 3:18ff; Rev. 3:3ff etc.), which H. Windisch, Hebräerbrief, 52ff particularly stresses. However, Hebr. makes of this call to repentance an instruction about the lot of those who have fallen away.

311) According to H. Windisch, Hebräerbrief, 52, the rejection of the second repentance was a doctrine "ausserhalb des Zusammenhangs des Hauptthemas". This doctrine is, however, closely connected with the main thoughts of the letter. Example: Christ's sacrifice was a sacrifice once and for all (7:27; 9:12; 10:10). That is why the apostate can be said to crucify the Son of God again (6:6). The blood of Christ seals the new, eternal covenant (8:6 - 10:18). It follows from this that those who apostatize hold the blood of the covenant as unclean (10:29).

312) O. Michel, Hebräer, 151: "Hb 6, 4-6 will nicht eine Grenze für die Vergebung Gottes aufrichten, auch nicht gefallene aus der Gemeinde ausschliessen, sondern eine Warnung vor dem Abfall aussprechen."

313) For text-critical problems see P. Katz, Quotations, 213-217.

314) See above p. 171.

315) See E.-B. Allo, 2 Cor., 54-63.

316) The following features are, however, common.
1. The sinner's behaviour causes distress to the community (1 Cor. 5:2; 2 Cor. 2:5).
2. The man is characterized by the same periphrase (1 Cor. 5:5 τὸν τοιοῦτον ; 2 Cor. 2:6 τῷ τοιούτῳ).
3. The punishment takes place on the grounds of Paul's written command (1 Cor. 5:5; 2 Cor. 2:9; 7:12).
4. The whole community takes part in the punishing (1 Cor. 5:4; 2 Cor. 2:6).
5. Paul partakes in the community's decision (1 Cor. 5:4; 2 Cor. 2:10).
6. Christ is present at both decisions (1 Cor. 5:4; 2 Cor. 2:10).
7. If the punishment is not annulled, the sinner will perish (1 Cor. 5:5; 2 Cor. 2:7).
8. Satan can profit from the punishment (1 Cor. 5:5; 2 Cor. 2:11).
9. By the punishment the community has maintained its purity (1 Cor. 5:6-8; 2 Cor. 7:11).

For arguments against identifying both cases see E.-B. Allo, 2 Cor., 56-60.

317) W. Doskocil, Bann, 81.

318) H. Windisch, Taufe, 143; B. Poschmann, Paenitentia, 34.

319) Πλείονες (2 Cor. 2:6) and πλῆθος (Acts 6:2; 15:12, 30) have both been connected with the designation רבים which is usual in the Qumran texts. Here it is a matter of a general Jewish terminus tecnicus for "the many", "the assembled people". See J. Jeremias, TWNT VI, 538f. Cf. H. Braun, Qumran I, 152, 198, who, however, interprets πλείονες as "the majority". Cf. also W. Bauer, Wörterbuch, 1367.

320) Καταρτίζω , "put in order", "prepare" is used in 2 Cor. 13:11 in a similar context. The church is exhorted to mutual brotherly reproving. Cf. C. H. Dodd, Matthew and Paul, 295: "This is no more than a paraphrase of Mt 18:15."

321) See above pp. 169, 174f.

322) RSV: "expose them".
NEB: "show them up for what they are".

323) Cf. F. Büchsel, TWNT II, 471, where ἐλέγχω (Eph. 5:11) in row 20 is given as having a personal object and in note 8 a neuter object.

324) A. Stein, Rechtshändel, has, however, argued that it was to the rabbis that the Corinthians went with their disputes.

325) P. Billerbeck, Kommentar IV, 1103f. L. Vischer, Auslegungsgeschichte, 10.

326) V. 4 can be understood as an ironical question or an ironical assertion, but not as a direct exhortation. Cf. L. Vischer, Auslegungsgeschichte, 13f.

327) To the Corinthian concept Luke 12:13f would constitute an excellent argument. Has the passage been handed down in such a milieu? J. Dauvillier has according to M. Delcor, Courts, 77 note 20, a more complicated proposal: On the basis of Luke 12:13f, the elders of the community were to abstain from solving disputes and instead encourage the laymen to appoint arbitrators.

328) E. Kohlmeyer, Charisma, 17f, and H. Conzelmann, Korinther, 127, see nothing sacral in this judicial system.

329) K. Stendahl, Prayer.

330) νουθεσία - νουθετέω are missing.
ἐπιτιμία - ἐπιτιμάω are missing.
ἔλεγχος is missing.
ἐλέγχω has a more variable usage: "convict" (John 8:46 with a human subject; John 16:8 with "the Advocate" as the subject), "expose" (John 3:20; 8:9 var. lect. with "the light" and "the conscience" as the subject respectively), "discipline" (Rev. 3:19 with Christ as the subject). See also above note 42.

331) See above p. 143f.

332) Rom. 16:18; 1 Cor. 5:5, 11; 2 Cor. 2:6f; 10:11; Gal. 6:1; cf. also Titus 3:11.

333) Understood thus, the words have parallels in the rabbinic rules for the ordination of rabbis. D. Daube, Judaism, 244-246.

334) See note 341.

335) Thus M. Dibelius, Pastoralbriefe, 50. Also J. Murphy-O'Connor, Péché, 173-175 here sees with uncertainty a "rite de réconciliation". H.-W. Bartsch, Anfänge, 101, brings forward as a reason for a

similar point of view that v. 20 dealt with forgiveness of sin, which is difficult to see. The laying on of hands for passing on forgiveness of sin is first testified in the third century A.D. W. Doskocil, Bann, 93.

336) Here probably in a meaning which includes both spiritual and bodily healing. Cf. F. Mussner, Jakobusbrief, 227.

337) W. Doskocil, Bann, 117f.

338) F. Mussner, Jakobusbrief, 226f note 7.

339) In James 1:18 "the word of truth" denotes the gospel, the powerful word of God, which gives birth to the Christian life. In 3:14 the word "truth" is used about the right, revealed wisdom, which - as v. 17 shows - is understood in a practical way as a mode of life. The actual expression "go astray from the truth" is found also in Wisd. Sol. 5:6 where it is used about people who have gone on the "paths of wickedness". It is also said in James 5:19f about the one who deviates from the truth that he has chosen a crooked way. It is, in other words, a matter of deviation from both the message and the way of life which it brings.

340) It is possible to translate it as "his own soul". But the whole situation points towards it being the soul of the one who has strayed and not the rescuer which is saved from death. See F. Mussner, Jakobusbrief, 232f.

341) However, not even this is undisputed. B. Reicke-B. Gärtner, De katolska breven, 306, translate διακρινομένους as "i det att de bliva prövade" (in that they are tried) and make the expression refer to those who are examined on entry into the commmunity. Yet the context speaks unequivocally for it here being a matter of people who have been exposed to the activity of heretics.

342) See C. A. Albin, Judasbrevet, 625f.

343) In case H. Windisch, Die kath. Briefen, 47 is not right when he guesses that ἐλεᾶτε in v. 23 replaced an original ἐκβάλετε.

344) Cf. W. D. Davies, Pattern, 218-220.

345) For literature see F. Nötscher, Heiligkeit, 166 note 11.

346) Against H. Thyen, Studien, 239.

347) R. Asting, Heiligkeit, 72ff, finds that the concept of holiness in the oldest strata of the synoptics was used with remarkable economy, but that where it is used, it is in a traditionally Jewish way. H. Braun, Qumran, II, 146f, points out the similarities between the holiness concept in Qumran and the NT, however with important reservations ("Qumran denkt im Unterschied zur Urgemeinde, gesetzlich-ritualistisch und ununiversalistisch", p. 147) and unfortunately without separating between the different groups of writings within the NT. It should, however, be noted that in no stratum do the synoptics expressly denote the Jesus fellowship as holy or the members of the community as holy (nor in Matt. 27:52). It is typical that Matt. 5:48

in the quotation from Lev. 19:2 exhorts the disciples to - not holiness but - perfection.

348) For the covenant motif in the NT see E. Lohmeyer, Diatheke; J. Coppens, Eglise; A. Jaubert, Notion, 447ff; R. F. Collins, Berîth-Notion, 582ff.

349) See above p. 72. Cf. p. 34.

350) See above pp. 34, 73f.

351) J. Jeremias, Gleichnisse, 39f.

352) Matt. 7:1 together with v. 2 is usually classed as a traditional Jewish saying. Cf. R. Bultmann, Geschichte, 111. But, to be accurate, it is only v. 2 which has clear rabbinic parallels. Cf. P. Billerbeck, Kommentar I, 441ff. Both in content as well as textually and stylistically there is a break between v. 1 and 2. V. 1 has a pointed radicalism which seems to polemize against efforts to form a "pure" community.

353) R. Asting, Heiligkeit, 133ff.

354) The passage is open for different interpretations. See G. Delling, Heilig, 84ff, for a survey of the possibilities. But it seems clear that a concept of massive holiness is assumed, which is transmittable by contact. Cf. H. Braun, Randglossen, 192.

355) H. Braun, Qumran I, 201ff; J. Gnilka, 2 Cor. 6:14 - 7:1.

356) See above all B. Gärtner, Temple, 49ff.

357) See above all H. Braun, Radikalismus I, 31 note 1.

358) See above p. 145.

359) But how the section came in remains a mystery. J. Gnilka, 2 Cor. 6:14 - 7:1, p. 67, refers to the thought that 2 Cor. is a collection of letters edited together afterwards. But this hypothesis alone does not solve the problem either.

360) For the combination of the ritual and the ethical in Qumran see H. Braun, Radikalismus I, 29 note 5; 106 note 1. For Paul's emphasis on the ethical side of the holiness concept see R. Asting, Heiligkeit, 202.

361) However, offences against the regulations of the community were considered as being polluting both in 1QS and in 2 Thess.

362) See above p. 150f.

363) Cf. Matt. 8:29.

364) O. Michel, Zeugnis, 70.

365) G. W. H. Lampe, Discipline, 356. interprets both Hebr. 10:26-31 and 1 John 5:16-17 as referring to denial in a situation of persecution, As far as Hebr. is concerned ἑκουσίως (10:26) probably speaks against such an interpretation. Concerning 1 John 5 see above p. 152ff.

366) See above pp. 41f, 176f.

367) Benevolence is to be adjusted according to the worth of each person (1QS I 9f; IX 12). Reproving is to be withheld from those who are without (1QS IX 16f). CD XX 2ff is here closer to the NT. See above pp. 48, 138.

368) E. G. Selwyn, 1 Peter, 369-466.

Final Remarks

Three questions about expulsion have been put to three religious milieus at the beginning of the Christian Era. I have tried to give the answers as objectively as possible, and will not repeat them here. But, let me in conclusion make some rather more subjective reflections. What is the most striking, and from our point of view the most interesting, in the answers we have received?

First of all, it is clear that the question concerning which deviations led to expulsion, was answered in ways which were characteristic of the respective communities. In Qumran one was particularly sensitive about offences against the holy structure of the sect. In rabbinic Judaism was stressed the authority of the transmitted halakah, in the oldest traditions particularly concerning matters of purity. In primitive Christianity it did happen that seriously oppositional members were expelled, but it was typical that the greatest restraint was shown in pointing out fixed deviations as reasons for expulsion - while at the same time, much was expected of the individual.

The result implies that there is a risk of present-day Christian communities drawing the limits for the religious community in a way which is fundamentally alien to primitive Christianity. When fixed, noticeable deviations are given as reasons for expulsion (be it definite moral transgressions, insufficient participation in activities, or neglect to pay the membership fee), the main point of the system of norms is displaced. The way the community limits are drawn shows which norms in reality are the strongest in the community.

Secondly: The answers to the question concerning how expulsion was carried out has shown that in primitive Christianity one felt free to take up modes of procedure which existed in the Jewish world round about. The assertion that the early church was independent of Jewish discipline is simply wrong. That which was unique about primitive Christianity did not lie on the organisational plane. And one can perhaps question whether present attempts to give the church a unique organisational profile do justice to primitive Christianity.

Finally, the question was asked as to what theological motifs were connected with expulsion. Here we saw that the motif of holiness dominated both in Qumran, the Pharisaic fellowship before 70 A.D., and in primitive Christianity after Easter - though with characteristic differences. This makes it all the more striking that Jesus himself seems to have radically rejected the motif of holiness as a motif for

deciding the limits of the community. For him it was the thought of the kingdom of God which decided where the limits of the community were to be drawn. It was not the holiness or purity of the community which was the most important, but the individual's standpoint in face of the message about the kingdom of God. And we saw that when the motif of holiness still made itself effective in the church after Easter, it did so with strong modifications which show how the inspiration from Jesus shines through. One did not reason consistently from the idea of the holiness of the community. It was not only the community which was to be protected. Solicitude for the individual was more important. Concern for the individual could lead to a person being expelled if he caused others to fall. It also found expression in the thought that it was best for the offender to suffer the punishment. But above all it gave increased weight to the need to try to put the offender right.

Present-day communities draw their limits with reference to completely different motifs and conceptions. But the fundamental alternatives are still appropriate. What is the most important: the quality of the community or the welfare of the individual deviator? The line Jesus took is absolutely clear.

Abbreviations

The Qumran texts are designated according to Discoveries I, 46-48. The titles of the Mishnah tractates are abbreviated according to the list in H. Danby, Mishnah, 806, but without dots. Tos, b and p before the abbreviation refer to the Tosephta, the Babylonian Talmud and the Palestinian Talmud, respectively. For abbreviations not listed here the reader is referred to RGG 3rd ed., Vol. 6, pp. XIX-XXXIII.

AGSU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums.
CB NT	Coniectanea Biblica, New Testament Series.
ÉtB	Études Bibliques.
RevQ	Revue de Qumran.
SNTS	Society for New Testament Studies. Monograph Series.
TNT	Tolkning av Nya Testamentet.
TWAT	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.
TWNT	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament.
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament.

Literature Quoted and Consulted

A. Texts and Translations

Biblia Hebraica ... Edidit R. Kittel et alii. 13th ed. Stuttgart 1962.

Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes. Edidit A. Ralphs. I - II. Stuttgart 1935.

Charles, R. H., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books. I - II. Oxford 1913.

Josephus with an English translation by H. St. J. Thackeray; R. Marcus; L. H. Feldman, vols. 1-9 (The Loeb Classical Library). London 1926-1965.

Flavius Josephus, De Bello Judaico, Der jüdische Krieg. Zweisprachige Ausgabe der sieben Bücher. Herausgegeben und mit einer Einleitung sowie mit Anmerkungen versehen von O. Michel und O. Bauernfeind. I. Bad Homburg vor der Höhe 1960. II. München 1963.

Adam, A., Antike Berichte über die Essener (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 182). Berlin 1961.

Schechter, S., Documents of Jewish Sectaries. Volume I. Fragments of a Zadokite Work edited from Hebrew Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection ... Cambridge 1910.

The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, II:2. Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline. Ed. by M. Burrows; J. C. Trever; W. H. Brownlee. New Haven, Conn. 1951.

The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline. Translation and Notes by W. H. Brownlee (BASOR Supplementary Studies 10-12). New Haven, Conn. 1951.

Zeitlin, S., The Zadokite Fragments. Facsimile of the Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection ... With an Introduction (JQR Monograph Series 1). Philadelphia 1952.

Reicke, B., Handskrifterna från Qumran, I-III (Symbolae Biblicae Upsaliensis, Supplementhäften til SEÅ 14). Uppsala 1952.

The Zadokite Documents. Ed. with a translation and notes by C. Rabin. Oxford 1954.

Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I-V. Ed. by D. Barthélemy; J. T. Milik; P. Benoit; R. de Vaux; M. Baillet; J. A. Sanders; J. M. Allegro. Oxford 1955-1968.

Ringgren, H., Handskrifterna från Qumran, IV-V (Symbolae Biblicae Upsaliensis, Supplementhäften till SEÅ 15). Uppsala 1956.
Wernberg-Møller, P., The Manual of Discipline. Translated and Annotated with an Introduction (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 1). Leiden 1957.
Lohse, E., Die Texte aus Qumran. Hebräisch und deutsch, mit masoretischer Punktation, Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen. München 1964.
The Mishnah, Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes by H. Danby. 9th ed. London 1967.
Mischnajot. Die sechs Ordnungen der Mischna. Hebräischer Text mit Punktation, deutscher Übersetzung und Erklärung. I-VI. 3rd ed. Basel 1968.
Der Babylonische Talmud mit Einschluss der vollstaendigen Mišnah, herausgegeben ... von L. Goldschmidt. I-IX. Berlin 1897-1903, Leipzig 1906-1922, Haag 1935.
The Babylonian Talmud. Translated into English with Notes, Glossary and Indices under the Editorship of I. Epstein. London (The Soncino Press) 1935-1952.
Der Jerusalemitische Talmud. Verlegt bei L. Lamm. Berlin 1920 (5680).
Le Talmud de Jérusalem. Traduit pour la première fois par M. Schwab. 2nd ed. Paris 1932-1933.
Tosephta. Based on the Erfurt and Vienna Codices with Parallels and Variants. Ed. by M. S. Zuckermandel. 2nd ed. Jerusalem 1937.
Novum Testamentum Graece cum apparatu critico curavit Eberhard Nestle, novis curis elaboraverunt Erwin Nestle et Kurt Aland. 25th ed. Stuttgart 1971.
The Greek New Testament. Ed. by K. Aland; M. Black; B. M. Metzger; A. Wikgren. London 1966.
Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. Locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et patrum adhibitis edidit K. Aland. Stuttgart 1964.
Die Apostolischen Väter. Neubearbeitung der funkschen Ausgabe von K. Bihlmeyer. 2nd ed. I (Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften 2:1, 1). Tübingen 1956.
E. Hennecke; W. Schneemelcher, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung, I-II. 3rd ed. Tübingen 1959-1964.
Greek Papyri in the British Museum (I). Catalogue, with Texts. Ed. by F. G. Kenyon, London 1893.

B. Modern Literature

Albin, C. A., Judasbrevet. Traditionen, texten, tolkningen. Lund 1962.
Allo, E. G., Saint Paul, Première Epitre aux Corinthiens (ÉtB). Paris 1934.
Saint Paul. Seconde Épître aux Corinthiens (ÉtB). Paris 1937.
Alt, A., "Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts" in: Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel, I. München 1953, pp. 278-332.
Arndt, W. F.; Gingrich, F. W., A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. 2nd ed. Cambridge 1957.
Asting, R., Die Heiligkeit im Urchristentum (FRLANT NF 29). Göttingen 1930.
Bacher, W., Die Agada der Tannaiten. I, 2nd ed. Strassburg 1903. II, Strassburg 1890.
Baltzer, K., Das Bundesformular (WMANT 4). Neukirchen 1960.
Bardtke, H. Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer, I-II. Berlin 1953-1958.
- (ed.), Qumran-Probleme. Vorträge des Leipziger Symposions über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961. Berlin 1963.
- "Qumrān und seine Probleme", ThR 33 (1968) 97-119, 185-236.
Barth, G., "Das Gesetzesverständnis des Evangelisten Matthäus" in: G. Bornkamm; G. Barth; H. J. Held, Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium (WMANT 1). Neukirchen Kreis Moers 1960, pp. 54-154.
Bartsch, H.-W., Die Anfänge Urchristlicher Rechtsbildungen. Studien zu den Pastoralbriefen (ThF 34). Hamburg-Bergstedt 1965.
Bauer, W., Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum (BHTh 10). Tübingen 1934.
- Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur. 5th ed. Berlin 1963.
Baumgartner, W., see Koehler, L.; Baumgartner, W.
Becker, U., Jesus und die Ehebrechering. Untersuchungen zur Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte von Joh. 7, 53-8, 11 (Beihefte zur ZNW 28). Berlin 1963.
Benoit, P. et alii, "Editing the Manuscript Fragments from Qumran", BA 19 (1956) 75-96.
Bertram, G.; Schmidt, K. L., ἔθνος, TWNT II (1933-1935) 362-370.
Bialoblocki, S., "Cherem" in: Encyclopaedia Judaica V. Berlin 1930, cols. 411-422.
Bietenhardt, H., "Sabbatvorschriften von Qumrān im Lichte des rabbinischen Rechts und der Evangelien" in: H. Bardtke (ed.), Qumran-Probleme. Berlin 1963, pp. 53-74.

Billerbeck, P., see Strack, H.; Billerbeck, P.
Billing, E., Guds närhet. Några betraktelser, predikningar och tal. Stockholm 1948.
Black, M., The Scrolls and Christian Origins, London 1961.
Böcher, O., "Wölfe in Schafspelzen. Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund von Matth. 7, 15", ThZ 24 (1968), 405-426.
Boecker, H.J., Redeformen des Rechtsleben im Alten Testament (WMANT 14). Neukirchen-Vluyn 1964.
Bohren, R., Das Problem der Kirchenzucht im Neuen Testament. Zollikon-Zürich 1952.
Bonnard, P., "La discipline ecclésiastique selon le Nouveau Testament" in: Centenaire de la Faculté de Théologie de l'Église évangélique libre du Canton de Vaud. Lausanne 1947, pp. 115-135.
- "Composition et signification historique de Matthieu XVIII" in: I. de la Potterie (ed.), De Jésus aux Évangiles. Tradition et Redaction dans les Évangiles synoptiques (BEThL 15:2). Gembloux, Paris 1967.
Bornkamm, G., Das Ende des Gesetzes. Paulusstudien. Gesammelte Aufsätze, Band 1 (BEvTh 16). 2nd ed. München 1958.
"Enderwartung und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium" in: G. Bornkamm; G. Barth; H.J. Held, Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium (WMANT 1). Neukirchen Kreis Moers 1960, pp. 13-47.
- "Die Binde- und Lösegewalt in der Kirche des Matthäus" in: G. Bornkamm; K. Rahner (ed.), Die Zeit Jesu. Festschrift für H. Schlier. Freiburg, Basel, Wien 1970, pp. 93-107.
Bousset, W., Die Offenbarung Johannis (MeyerK XVI 6). Göttingen 1906.
Brandenburger, E., Fleisch und Geist. Paulus und die dualistische Weisheit (WMANT 29). Neukirchen-Vluyn 1968.
Braun, F.M., Neues Licht auf die Kirche. Die protestantische Kirchendogmatik in ihrer neuesten Entfaltung. Einsiedeln, Köln 1946.
Braun, H., Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus. Jesus von Nazareth und die essenische Qumransekte, I-II (BHTh 24). Tübingen 1957.
- "Exegetische Randglossen zum 1. Korintherbrief" in: Gesammelte Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt. Tübingen 1962, pp. 178-204.
- "Literar-Analyse und theologische Schichtung im ersten Johannesbrief" in: Gesammelte Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt. Tübingen 1962, pp. 210-242.
- Qumran und das Neue Testament, I-II. Tübingen 1966.
Brichto, H.C., The Problem of "Curse" in the Hebrew Bible (JBL Monograph Series 13). Philadelphia 1963.
Brown, S., Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke (AnBibl 36). Rome 1969.

Brun, L., Segen und Fluch im Urchristentum (SNVAO II, Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1932, 1). Oslo 1932.
Buchanan, G.W., "The Role of Purity in the Structure of the Essene Sect". RevQ IV (1963-1964) 397-406.
Büchsel, F., δέω , TWNT II (1933-1935) 59-60.
- δίδωμι etc., TWNT II (1933-1935) 168-175.
- ἐλέγχω , TWNT II (1933-1935) 470-474.
Bultmann, R., "Analyse der ersten Johannesbriefe" in: Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher. Tübingen 1927, pp. 138-158.
- "Die kirchliche Redaktion des ersten Johannesbriefes" in: In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer. Stuttgart 1951, pp. 189-201.
- Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (FRLANT NF 12). 6th ed. Göttingen 1964.
- Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Neue Theologische Grundrisse). 5th ed. Tübingen 1965.
- Die drei Johannesbriefe (MeyerK XIV 8). 2nd ed. Göttingen 1969.
Burchard, C., Bibliographie zu den Handschriften vom Toten Meer. I (ZAW Beiheft 76). Berlin 1957. II (ZAW Beiheft 89). Berlin 1965.
Cambier, J., "La Chair et l'Esprit en 1 Cor V. 5", NTS 15 (1968-1969) 221-232.
Campenhausen, H.F. von, Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten (BHTh 14). Tübingen 1953.
Cerfaux, L., "L'Église dans l'Apocalypse" in: Aux Origines de l'Église (Recherches Bibliques 7). Bruges 1965, pp. 111-124.
Charles, R.H., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Revelation of St. John (ICC). Vol. I. Edinburgh 1920.
Collins, R.F., "The Berîth-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Covenant and its Comparison with the New Testament", EphLov 39 (1963) 555-594.
Conzelmann, H., Der erste Brief an die Korinther (MeyerK V 11). Göttingen 1969.
Coppens, J., "L'Église, nouvelle alliance de Dieu avec son peuple" in: Aux Origines de l'Église (Recherches Bibliques 7). Bruges 1965, pp. 13-22.
Cross, F.M. jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. 2nd ed. New York 1961.
Dahl, N.A., Das Volk Gottes. Eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewusstsein des Urchristentums (SNVAO II, Hist.-Filos. Klasse, 1941, 2). Oslo 1941.
Dalman, G., Die Worte Jesu mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüdischen Schrifttums und der aramäischen Sprache, I. Leipzig 1898.
Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch. 2nd ed. Frankfurt am Main 1922.

Daniel, C., " 'Faux prophètes': Surnom des esséniens dans le sermon sur la montagne", RevQ VII (1969) 17-79.
Daniélou, J., "La communauté de Qumrân et l'organisation de l'Eglise ancienne", RHPhR 35 (1955) 104-116.
Daube, D., Studies in Biblical Law. Cambridge 1947.
- The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (Jordan Lectures 1952). London, Bristol 1956.
Davies, W.D., Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology. London 1948.
- "A Normative Pattern of Church Life in the New Testament" in: Christian Origins and Judaism. London 1962, pp. 199-229.
- The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount. Cambridge 1964.
Deissmann, A., Licht vom Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt. 4th ed. Tübingen 1923.
Delcor, M., "Le vocabulaire juridique, cultuel et mystique de l'"initiation" dans la secte de Qumrân" in: H. Bardtke (ed.), Qumran-Probleme. Berlin 1963, pp. 109-134.
- "The Courts of the Church of Corinth and the Courts of Qumran" in: J. Murphy-O'Connor (ed.), Paul and Qumran. London 1968, pp. 69-84.
Delling, G., "Nun aber sind sie heilig" in: Gott und die Götter. Festgabe für Erich Fascher zum 60. Geburtstag. Berlin 1958, pp. 84-93.
- ἄταχτος TWNT VIII (1965-1969) 48f.
Denis, A.-M., "Évolution de Structures dans la Secte de Qumrân" in: Aux Origines de l'Église (Recherches Bibliques 7) Bruges 1965, pp. 23-49.
Dibelius, M., Die Pastoralbriefe (HNT 13). 2nd ed. Tübingen 1931.
- An die Thessalonicher I, II. An die Philipper (HNT 11). 3rd ed. Tübingen 1937.
- An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon (HNT 12). Dritte Auflage neu bearbeitet von H. Greeven. Tübingen 1953.
Dinkler, E., "Petrusbekenntnis und Satanswort" in: E. Dinkler; H. Thyen (ed.), Zeit und Geschichte. Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag. Tübingen 1964, pp. 127-153.
Dobschütz, E. von, Die Thessalonicher-Briefe (MeyerK X 7). Göttingen 1909.
Dodd, C.H., "Matthew and Paul", ET 58 (1946-1947) 293-298.
Dölger, F.J., Der Taufexorzismus im christlichen Altertum. Würzburg 1906.
Döller, J., "Der Bann (Ḥerem) im Alten Testament und im späteren Judentum", ZKTh 37 (1913) 1-24.
Donahue, J.H., "Tax Collectors and Sinners. An Attempt at Identification", CBQ 33 (1971) 39-61.

Doskocil, W., Der Bann in der Urkirche, Eine rechtsgeschichtliche Untersuchung (MThS III 11). München 1958.
- "Exkommunikation", RAC VII (1966-1969) cols. 1-22.
Ebeling, G., Kirchenzucht. Stuttgart 1947.
Eissfeldt, O., Einleitung in das Alte Testament unter Einschluss der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen sowie der apokryphen- und pseudepigraphenartigen Qumrān-Schriften. Entstehungsgeschichte des Alten Testaments (Neue Theologische Grundrisse), 3rd ed. Tübingen 1964.
Elliger, K., "Ich bin der Herr - Euer Gott" in: Theologie als Glaubenswagnis. Festschrift für Karl Heim zum 80. Geburtstag. Hamburg 1954, pp. 9-34.
- Leviticus (HAT I 4). Tübingen 1966.
Eybers, I.H., Aspekte van die Organisasie en Rites van die Joodse Qoemraan-Sekte. Pretoria 1961. (Summarized by N. Tromp in RevQ IV 1963-1964, 121-127.)
Feine, P.; Behm, J., Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Völlig neu bearbeitet von W.G. Kümmel. 16th ed. Heidelberg 1969.
Feuillet, A., L'Apocalypse. Etat de la question (Studia Neotestamentica Subsidia 3). Paris, Bruges 1963.
Finkelstein, L., The Pharisees. The Sociological Background of their Faith, I-II. Philadelphia 1946.
Fitzmyer, J.A., "A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor 11:10" in: J. Murphy-O'Connor (ed.), Paul and Qumran. London 1968, pp. 31-47.
Foerster, W., ἄξιος etc., TWNT I (1932-1933) 378-380.
- σατανᾶς , TWNT VII (1960-1964) 151-164.
- σῴζω etc., TWNT VII (1960-1964) 966-1004.
Fridrichsen, A., "Sich selbst verleugnen" in: Adolf Jülicher zum achtzigjährigen Geburtstage 26. Januar 1937 (Arbeiten und Mitteilungen aus dem Neutestamentlichen Seminar zu Uppsala 4). Uppsala, Helsingfors 1937, pp. 1-8.
Friedrich, G., "Propheten in der alten Kirche", TWNT VI (1954-1959) 829-863.
Gärtner, B., The Temple and the Community in Qumran and in the New Testament. A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament (SNTS 1). Cambridge 1965.
Gerhardsson, B., "Nycklamakten enligt Skriften" in: E. Segelberg (ed.), Himmelrikets nycklar. Predikningar och föredrag hållna vid Kyrklig Förnyelses Kyrkodagar kring Bikten och Själavården i Upsala 1962. Växjö 1963, pp. 41-74.
- Memory and Manuscript. Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity (ASNU 22). 2nd ed. Lund, Copenhagen 1964.

Gerhardsson, B., "De kristologiska utsagorna i sändebreven i Uppenbarelseboken (kap. 2-3)", SEÅ 30 (1965) 70-90.
- The Testing of God's Son (Matt 4:1-11 & par). An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash. Chapters 1-4 (CB NT 2, 1). Lund 1966.
- "Einige Bemerkungen zu Apg 4, 32". StTh 24 (1970) 142-149.
Gesenius, W. Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament. 16th ed. Bearbeitet von F. Buhl. Leipzig 1915.
Giblin, C.H., The Threat to Faith. An Exegetical and Theological Re-examination of 2 Thessalonians 2 (AnBibl 31). Rome 1967.
Gnilka, J., "Die Kirche des Matthäus und die Gemeinde von Qumrân", BZ NF 7 (1963) 43-63.
- "2 Cor 6:14 - 7:1 in the Light of the Qumran Texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs" in: J. Murphy-O'Connor (ed.), Paul and Qumran. London 1968, pp. 48-68.
Goguel, M., L'Église primitive (Jésus et les origines du christianisme 3). Paris 1947.
Goldstein, M., Jesus in the Jewish Tradition. New York 1950.
Guilbert, P., "Le Plan de la 'Règle de la Communauté'", RevQ I (1958-1959) 323ff.
Haenchen, E., Die Apostelgeschichte (MeyerK III 10). Göttingen 1956.
- "Neuere Literatur zu den Johannesbriefen", ThR NF 26 (1960) 1-43, 267-291.
- "Die Komposition von Mk. VII 27 - IX 1 und Par.", NovTest VI (1963) 81-109.
Hahn, F., Christologische Hoheitstitel (FRLANT 83). 2nd ed. Göttingen 1964.
Hare, D.R.A., The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St Matthew (SNTS 6). Cambridge 1967.
Harnack, A., Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel nebst Untersuchungen zur ältesten Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts (TU II 1-2). Leipzig 1884.
- Entstehung und Endwickelung der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten. Nebst einer Kritik der Abhandlung R. Sohm's "Wesen und Ursprung des Katholizismus" und Untersuchungen über "Evangelium", "Wort Gottes" und das trinitarische Bekenntnis. Leipzig 1910.
Hartman, L., Testimonium Linguae. Participial Constructions in the Synoptic Gospels. - A Linguistic Examination of Luke 21, 13 (CN 19). Lund, Copenhagen, Uppsala 1963.
Hauck, F., ὑπομένω etc., TWNT IV (1938-1942) 585-593.
Heise, J., Bleiben. Menein in den Johanneischen Schriften (HUTh 8). Tübingen 1967.
Heitmüller, W., Im Namen Jesu (FRLANT 1:2). Göttingen 1903.
Hempel, J., "Die israelitischen Anschauungen von Segen und Fluch im Lichte altorientalischer Parallelen", ZDMG NF 4 (1925) 20-110.

Hengel, M., Die Zeloten, Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n. Chr. (AGSU 1). Leiden, Köln 1961.
- Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh. v. Chr. (WUNT 10). Tübingen 1969.
Herford, R.T., "Pharisees", The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia VIII (1948) 473-475.
Herkenrath, J., "Sünde zum Tode" in: Aus Theologie und Philosophie. Festschrift für Fritz Tillmann zu seinem 75. Geburtstag. Düsseldorf 1950, pp. 119-138.
Hoenig, S.B., The Great Sanhedrin. A Study of the Origin, Development, Composition and Functions of the Bet Din ha-Gadol during the Second Jewish Commonwealth. Philadelphia 1953.
Holtz, T., Die Christologie der Apokalypse des Johannes (TU 85). Berlin 1962.
Horst, F., Gottes Recht. Gesammelte Studien zum Recht im Alten Testament. Herausgegeben von H.W. Wolff (ThB AT 12). München 1961.
Hübner, H., "Zölibat in Qumran?", NTS 17 (1970-1971) 153-167.
Hunzinger, C.-H., Die jüdische Bannpraxis im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. (Typewritten.) Göttingen 1954. (For a summary, see ThLZ 80, 1955, col. 114f.
- "Aus der Arbeit an den unveröffentlichten Texten von Qumrān", ThLZ 85 (1960) col. 151f.
- "Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung der Disziplinarordnung der Gemeinde von Qumrān" in: H. Bardtke (ed.), Qumran-Probleme. Berlin 1963, pp. 231-247.
- "Spuren pharisäischer Institutionen in der frühen rabbinischen Überlieferung" in: Tradition und Glaube. Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt. Festgabe für K.G. Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag. Göttingen 1971.
Huppenbauer, H., "טהר" und טהרה in der Sektenregel von Qumran", ThZ 13 (1957) 350f.
Huss, W., Die Gemeinde der Apokalypse des Johannes. Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der theologischen Doktorwürde an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München. (No place of publication.) 1967.
Hvidberg, F.F., Menigheden af den nye Pagt i Damascus. Nogle Studier over de af Salomo Schechter fundne og under Titlen "Fragments of a Zakokite Work" udgivne Genîza fragmenter ("Damascusskriftet"). København 1928.
Isaksson, A., Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple. A Study with Special Reference to Mt. 19. 3-12 and 1. Cor. 11. 3-16 (ASNU 24). Lund 1965.

Israel, J., Socialpsykologi. Teori, problem, forskning. Stockholm 1960.
Israel, J. (ed.), Sociala avvikelser och social kontroll. 2nd ed. Stockholm, Uppsala 1968.
Janzon, P., "Nikolaiterna i Nya Testamentet och i Fornkyrkan", SEÅ 21 (1956) 82-108.
Jastrow, M., A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, I-II. London, New York 1903.
Jaubert, A., La notion d'alliance dans le judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne. Paris, Niort 1963.
Jenni, E., Das hebräische Pi'el. Syntaktisch-semasiologische Untersuchung einer Verbalform im Alten Testament. Zürich 1968.
Jeremias, J., "Untersuchungen zum Quellenproblem der Apostelgeschichte", ZNW 36 (1937) 205-221.
- κλείς , TWNT III (1935-1938) 743-753.
- πάσχα , TWNT V (1944-1954) 895-903.
- Jesu Verheissung für die Völker (Franz Delitzsch-Vorlesungen 1953). Stuttgart 1956.
- πολλοί , TWNT VI (195-1959) 536-545.
- Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu. Eine kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte. 3rd ed. Göttingen 1962.
- Die Gleichnisse Jesu. 7th ed. Göttingen 1965.
- Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu. 4th ed. Göttingen 1967.
Kaddari, M. Z., "The Root TKN in the Qumran Texts", RevQ V (1964-1966) 219-224.
Käsemann, E., "Die Legitimität des Apostels. Eine Untersuchung zu II Korinther 10-13" in: K. H. Rengstorf (ed.), Das Paulusbild in der neueren deutschen Forschung (Wege der Forschung 24). Darmstadt 1964, pp. 475-521.
- "Sätze heiligen Rechtes im Neuen Testament" in: Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen II. 2nd ed. Göttingen 1965, pp. 69-82.
Kapelrud, A. S., "Die aktuellen und die eschatologischen Behörden der Qumrangemeinde" in: H. Bardtke (ed.), Qumran-Probleme. Berlin 1963, pp. 259-268.
- "Der Bund in den Qumran-Schriften" in: Bibel und Qumran. Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaft. Hans Bardtke zum 22.9.1966. Berlin 1968, pp. 137-149.
Katz, P., "The Quotations from Deuteronomy in Hebrews", ZNW 49 (1958) 213-223.
Kilian, R., Literarkritische und formgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Heiligkeitsgesetzes (BBB 19). Bonn 1963.
Kittel, G., ἀκούω etc. TWNT I (1932-1933) 216-225.
Klostermann, E., Das Matthäusevangelium (HNT 4). 2nd ed. Tübingen 1927.

Köhler, L., "Die hebräische Rechtsgemeinde" in: Der hebräische Mensch. Tübingen 1953, pp. 143-171.
Koehler, L.; Baumgartner, W., Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden 1953 (= L. Koehler, Lexicon.)
Koehler, L.; Baumgartner, W., Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament. 3rd ed. I. Leiden 1967. (= W. Baumgartner, Lexikon.)
Kohler, K., "Zealots" in: JewEnc 12. New York, London 1906, pp. 639-643.
Kohlmeyer, E., "Charisma oder Recht? Vom Wesen des ältesten Kirchenrechts", ZSavRG Kanonische Abteilung 38 (1952) 1-36.
Krauss, S., Synagogale Altertümer. Berlin, Wien 1922.
Kümmel, W. G., Kirchenbegriff und Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Urgemeinde und bei Jesus (SyBU 1). Uppsala, Zürich 1943.
- "Jesus und die Anfänge der Kirche", StTh 7 (1953) 1-27.
- Einleitung, see Feine, P.; Behm, J.
- Anhang, see Lietzmann, H., An die Korinther.
Kuhn, K. G., Βαλαάμ , TWNT I (1932-1933) 521ff.
- "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften. 43. Zum heutigen Stand der Qumranforschung", ThLZ 85 (1960) cols. 649-658.
- "Giljonim und sifre minim" in: W. Eltester (ed.), Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche. Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias (Beihefte zur ZNW 26). Berlin 1960, pp. 24-61.
- Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten. Göttingen 1960.
- "Nachträge zur 'Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten'", RevQ IV (1963-1964) 164-234.
Kuss, O., Der Römerbrief, I-II. Regensburg 1957-1959.
Lampe, G. W. H., "Church Discipline and the Interpretation of the Epistles to the Corinthians" in: W. R. Farmer et alii (ed.), Christian History and Interpretation: Studies presented to J. Knox. Cambridge 1967, pp. 337-361.
- (ed.), A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford 1961-1968.
La Sor, W. S., Bibliography of the Dead See Scrolls (Fuller Library Bulletin. Fuller Theological Seminary. Bibliographical Series 2). Pasadena, Calif. 1958.
Latte, K., Heiliges Recht. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der sakralen Rechtsformen in Griechenland. Tübingen 1920.
Liddell, H. G.; Scott, R., A Greek-English Lexicon, I-II. Oxford 1925-1940. E. A. Barber (ed.), Supplement. Oxford 1968.
Lieberman, S., Greek in Jewish Palestine. Studies in the Life and Manners of Jewish Palestine in the II-IV Centuries C. E. New York 1942.
- "The Discipline in the so-called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline", JBL 71 (1952) 199-206.

Liedke, G., Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze. Eine formgeschichtlich-terminologische Studie (WMANT 39). Neukirchen, Vluyn 1971.
Lietzmann, H., Messe und Herrenmahl. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Liturgie (AKG 8). Bonn 1926.
- An die Korinther, I-II (HNT 9). 4th ed. With an "Anhang" by W.G.Kümmel, Tübingen 1949.
Linton, O., Das Problem der Urkirche in der neueren Forschung. Eine kritische Darstellung. Uppsala 1932.
Lönnermark, L.G., Paulusbreven - egenhändigt skrivna, dikterade eller utformade av sekreterare. (Typewritten.) Lund 1968.
Lövestam, E., Spiritus Blasphemia. Eine Studie zu Mk 3, 28f par Mt 12, 31f, Lk 12, 10 (Scripta Minora Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis 1966-1967:1). Lund 1968.
Lohmeyer, E., Diatheke. Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung des neutestamentlichen Begriffe (UNT 2). Leipzig 1913.
- Die Offenbarung des Johannes (HNT 16). Tübingen 1926.
Lohse, B., Das Passafest der Quartadecimaner (BFChTh 2:54). Gütersloh 1953.
Lohse, E., Märtyrer und Gottesknecht. Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom Sühntod Jesu Christi (FRLANT NF 46). Göttingen 1955.
- συνέδριον, TWNT VII (1960-1964) 858-869.
Mc Carthy, D.J., Treaty and Covenant. A Study in Form in the Ancient Oriental Documents and in the Old Testament (AnBibl 21). Rome 1963.
M'Neile, A.H., The Gospel According to St. Matthew. The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. 9th ed. New York 1965.
Mantel, H., Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin (Harvard Semitic Studies 17). Cambridge, Mass. 1961.
Mendenhall, G.E., "Ancient Oriental and Biblical Law", BA 17 (1954) 25-46.
- "Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition", BA 17 (1954) 3, 50-76.
Menoud, P.-H., "La mort d'Ananias et de Saphira (Actes 5. 1-11)" in: Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne. Mélanges offerts à M.Goguel. Neuchatel, Paris 1950, pp. 146-154.
Meyer, A., "Die Entstehung des Markusevangeliums" in: Festgabe für Adolf Jülicher zum 70.Geburtstag 26.Januar 1927. Tübingen 1927, pp. 35-60.
Meyer, R., φαρισαῖος A. Der Pharisäismus im Judentum. TWNT IX (1969-) 11-36
Michel, O., Das Zeugnis des Neuen Testamentes von der Gemeinde (FRLANT NF 39). Göttingen 1941.
- μικρός etc. TWNT IV (1938-1942) 650-661.
- Der Brief an die Römer (MeyerK IV 10). Göttingen 1955.

Michel, O., τελώνης, TWNT VIII (1965-1969) 88-106.
Mignard, J.E., Jewish and Christian Cultic Discipline to the Middle of the Second Century. (Typewritten.) Boston 1966. (For a summary, see Dissertation Abstracts 27, 1966-1967, 1437 A.)
Milik, J.T., Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea (Studies in Biblical Theology 26). London 1959.
- Review of: The Manual of Discipline. Translated and Annotated with an Introduction. Leiden 1957, by P.Wernberg-Møller. RB 67 (1960) 410-416.
Milligan, G., St.Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians. The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes. London 1908.
Moe, O., Johannes Uppenbarelse. Bibelns sista bok (TNT 11). Stockholm 1963.
Moore, G.F., Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of the Tannaim. I-III. Cambridge 1927-1930.
Moule, C.F.D., An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek. 2nd ed. Cambridge 1963.
Moulton, J.H.; Milligan, G., The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources. London 1914-1929.
Murphy-O'Connor, J., "Péché et Communauté dans le Nouveau Testament", RB 74 (1967) 161-163.
- (ed.), Paul and Qumran. Studies in New Testament Exegesis. London, Dublin, Melbourne 1968.
- "La Genèse Littéraire de la Règle de la Communauté", RB 76 (1969) 528-549.
Mussner, F., Der Jakobusbrief (HThK 13:1). Freiburg, Basel, Wien 1964.
Nauck, W., Die Tradition und der Charakter des ersten Johannesbriefes, Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Taufe im Urchristentum und in der alten Kirche (WUNT 3). Tübingen 1957.
Neusner, J., "The Fellowship (חבורה) in the Second Jewish Commonwealth", HThR 53 (1960) 125-142.
- A Life of Rabban Yohanan ben Zakkai, Ca. 1-80 C.E. (Studia Post-Biblica 6). Leiden 1962.
Newcomb, T.M., Social Psychology. London 1952.
Nötscher, F., "Heiligkeit in den Qumranschriften", RevQ II (1959-1960) 163-181, 315-344.
Odeberg, H., Ἰεζάβελ, TWNT III (1935-1938) 218.
- Pauli brev till korintierna (TNT 7). 3rd ed. Stockholm 1965.
Pedersen, J., Der Eid bei den Semiten in seinem Verhältnis zu verwandten Erscheinungen sowie die Stellung des Eides im Islam (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des islamischen Orients 3). Strassburg 1914.
- Israel, I-II. Sjaeleliv og Samfundsliv. 2nd ed. København 1934.

Pesch, W., "Die sogenannte Gemeindeordnung Mt 18", BZ NF 7 (1963) 220-235.
- Matthäus der Seelsorger. Das neue Verständnis der Evangelien dargestellt am Beispiel von Matthäus 18 (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 2). Stuttgart 1966.
Popkes, W., Christus Traditus. Eine Untersuchung zum Begriff der Dahingabe im Neuen Testament (AThANT 49). Zürich, Stuttgart 1967.
Poschmann, B., Paenitentia secunda. Die kirchliche Busse im ältesten Christentum bis Cyprian und Origenes. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung (Theophaneia 1). Bonn 1940.
Preisker, H., See Windisch, H.
Rabin, C., Qumran Studies (Scripta Judaica 2). London 1957.
Rabinowitz, I., "The Meaning and Date of 'Damascus' Document IX 1", RevQ VI (1967-1969) 433-435.
Rad, G. von, Das Gottesvolk im Deuteronomium (BWANT 3:11). Stuttgart 1929.
- Theologie des Alten Testaments, I-II (Einführung in die evangelische Theologie 1). München 1957-1960.
- Das fünfte Buch Mose. Deuteronomium (ATD 8). Göttingen 1964.
Reicke, B., Diakonie, Festfreude und Zelos in Verbindung mit der altchristlichen Agapenfeier (UUÅ 1951:5). Uppsala 1951.
- "Die Verfassung der Urgemeinde im Lichte jüdischer Dokumente", ThZ 10 (1954) 95-112.
Reicke, B.; Gärtner, B., De katolska breven (TNT 10:2). Stockholm 1970.
Reventlow, H., Das Heiligkeitsgesetz formgeschichtlich untersucht (WMANT 6). Neukirchen Kreis Moers 1961.
Riesenfeld, H., "Perikopen de adultera i den fornkyrkliga traditionen", SEÅ 17 (1952) 106-118.
Rigaux, B., Saint Paul. Les épitres aux Thessaloniciens. Paris, Gembloux 1956.
Ringgren, H., The Prophetical Conception of Holiness (UUÅ 1948:12). Uppsala 1948.
- Tro och liv enligt Döda-havsrullarna. Stockholm 1961.
Robertson, A.; Plummer, A., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (ICC). Edinburgh 1911.
Rost, L., "Der 'Lehrer der Einung' und der 'Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit'", ThLZ 78 (1953) cols. 143-148.
- "Die Anhänge der Ordensregel (1QSa und 1QSb)", ThLZ 82 (1957) cols. 667-672.
- "Zur Struktur der Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes im Lande Damaskus", VT 9 (1959) 393-398.

Sand, A., Der Begriff "Fleisch" in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen (BU 2). Regensburg 1967.
Satake, A., Die Gemeindeordnung in der Johannesapokalypse (WMANT 21). Neukirchen, Vluyn 1966.
Scharbert, J., "'Fluchen' und 'Segnen' im Alten Testament", Bibl 39 (1958) 1-26.
- Solidarität in Segen und Fluch im Alten Testament und in seiner Umwelt, I. Väterfluch und Vätersegen. Bonn. 1958.
- אלה , TWAT I (1971-) 279-285.
- ארר , TWAT I (1971-) 437-451.
Schlatter, A., Die Kirche des Matthäus (BFChTh 33:1). Gütersloh 1929.
- Paulus der Bote Jesu. Eine Deutung seiner Briefe an die Korinther. Stuttgart 1934.
Schlier, H., θλίβω etc., TWNT III (1935-1938) 139-148.
- Der Brief an die Epheser. 5th ed. Düsseldorf 1965.
Schmidt, K. L., "Die Kirche des Urchristentums" in: Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann zum 60. Geburtstag 7. November 1926. Tübingen 1927, pp. 258-319.
- ἐκκλησία , TWNT III (1935-1938) 502-539.
- ἔθνος , see Bertram, G.; Schmidt, K. L.
Schmithals, W., Die Gnosis in Korinth (FRLANT NF 48). Göttingen 1956.
Schmitt, J., "Contribution à l'étude de la discipline pénitentielle dans l'Eglise primitive à la lumière des textes de Qumran" in: Les manuscrits de la Mer morte. Colloque de Strasbourg 25-27 mai 1955. Paris 1957, pp. 93-109.
Schmitz, O., "Die Grenze der Gemeinde nach dem Neuen Testament", EvTh 14 (1954) 6-22.
Schnackenburg, R., Die Johannesbriefe (HThK 13:3). Freiburg 1953.
- Die Kirche im Neuen Testament. Ihre Wirklichkeit und theologische Deutung. Ihr Wesen und Geheimnis (Quaestiones disputatae 14). Freiburg 1961.
- Gottes Herrschaft und Reich. 4th ed. Freiburg 1965.
Schneider, C., "Zur Problematik des Hellenistischen in den Qumrāntexten" in: H. Bardtke (ed.), Qumran-Probleme. Berlin 1963, pp. 299-314.
Schottroff, W., Der altisraelitische Fluchspruch (WMANT 30). Neukirchen, Vluyn 1969.
Schrage, W., "'Ekklesia' und 'Synogoge'. Zum Ursprung des urchristlichen Kirchenbegriff", ZThK 60 (1963) 178-202.
Schürer, E., Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. I, 3rd/4th ed. Leipzig 1901. II-III, 4th ed. Leipzig 1907-1909.
Schürmann, H., Das Lukasevangelium I (1,1 - 9,50) (HThK 3). Freiburg, Basel, Wien 1969.
Schulz, H., Das Todesrecht im Alten Testament. Studien zur Rechtsform der Mot-Jumat-Sätze (ZAW Beiheft 114). Berlin 1969.

Schweizer, E., Gemeinde und Gemeindeordnung im Neuen Testament (AThANT 35). Zürich 1959.
- πνεῦμα etc., E. Das Neue Testament. TWNT VI (1954-1959) 394-449.
Selwyn, E.G., The First Epistle of St. Peter. The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Essays. London 1946.
Sherwin-White, A.N., Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament (The Sarum Lectures 1960-1961). Oxford 1963.
Sjöberg, E., Gott und die Sünder im palästinensischen Judentum nach dem Zeugnis der Tannaiten und der apokryphisch-pseudepigraphischen Literatur (BWANT 4:27). Stuttgart 1938.
Smith, M., "Zealots and Sicarii, their Origins and Relation", HThR 64 (1971) 1-19.
Snaith, N.H., The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament. London 1944.
Sohm, R., Kirchenrecht, I. Die Geschichtlichen Grundlagen (Systematisches Handbuch der deutschen Rechtswissenschaft 8:1). Leipzig 1892.
- Wesen und Ursprung des Katholizismus. Durch ein Vorwort vermehrten zweiten Abdruck. Leipzig, Berlin 1912.
Stauffer, E., Christus und die Caesaren. Historische Skizzen. Hamburg 1948.
- "Jüdisches Erbe im urchristlichen Kirchenrecht", ThLZ 77 (1952) cols. 201-206.
Stegemann, H., "Weitere Stücke von 4Qp Psalm 37, von 4Q Patriarchal Blessings und Hinweis auf eine unedierte Handschrift aus Höhle 4Q mit Exzerpten aus dem Deuteronomium", RevQ VI (1967-1969) 193-227.
Stein, A., "Wo trugen die korinthischen Christen ihre Rechtshändel aus?" ZNW 59 (1968) 86-90.
Stendahl, K. (ed.), The Scrolls and the New Testament. New York 1957.
- "Prayer and Forgiveness", SEÅ 22-23 (1957-1958) 75-86.
- "Kirche im Urchristentum", RGG 3rd ed. III (1959) cols. 1297-1304.
- The School of St. Matthew and its use of the Old Testament. 2nd ed. Lund 1968.
Strack, H.; Billerbeck, P., Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. I-IV, München 1922-1928. V-VI (Index etc.) München 1956-1961. (= P. Billerbeck, Kommentar.)
Strack, H.L., Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. New York 1965.
Strathmann, H., μάρτυς etc. TWNT IV (1938-1942) 477-520.
Strecker, G., Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit. Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus (FRLANT 82). Göttingen 1962.
Streeter, B.H., The Primitive Church Studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry (The Hewett lectures 1928). London 1929.

Strugnell, J., "Notes en Marge du Volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan'", RevQ VII (1970) 163-276.
Sundkler, B., "Jésus et les paien" in: B. Sundkler; A. Fridrichsen, Contributions à l'étude de la pensée missionaire dans le Nouveau Testament (Arbeiten und Mitteilungen aus dem neutestamentlichen Seminar zu Uppsala 6). Uppsala, Paris 1937, pp. 1-38.
Thompson, W.G., Matthew's Advice to a Divided Community, Mt. 17, 22-18, 35 (AnBibl 44). Rome 1970.
Thraede, K., "Exorzismus", RAC VII (1969) cols. 44-117.
Thyen, H., Studien zur Sündenvergebung im Neuen Testament und seinen alttestamentlichen und jüdischen Voraussetzungen (FRLANT 96), Göttingen 1970.
Trilling, W., Das wahre Israel. Studien zur Theologie des Matthäus-Evangeliums (Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 10). München 1964.
Tsevat, M., "Studies in the Book of Samuel", HUCA 32 (1961) 191-216.
Unnik, W.C. van, "The Christian's Freedom of Speech in the New Testament", Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 44:2 (1962) 466-488.
Vaux, R. de, Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament, I-II. Paris 1958-1960.
Vermes, G., "The Decalogue and the Minim" in: M. Black; G. Fohrer (ed.), In Memoriam Paul Kahle. Berlin 1968, pp. 232-240.
Via, D.O. jr., "The Church as the Body of Christ in the Gospel of Matthew", Scottish Journal of Theology 11 (1958) 271-286.
Vischer, L., Die Auslegungsgeschichte von I.Kor. 6, 1-11. Rechtsverzicht und Schlichtung (Beiträge zur Geschichte der neutestamentlichen Exegese 1). Tübingen 1955.
Vliet, H. van, No Single Testimony. A Study on the Adoption of the Law of Deut. 19:15 par. into the New Testament. Utrecht 1958.
Vögtle, A., Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament, exegetisch, religions- und formgeschichtlich untersucht (NTA 16, 4-5). Münster in Westfalen 1936.
Wagner, V., "Umfang und Inhalt der mōt-jūmat-Reihe", Orientalische Literaturzeitung 63 (1968) 325-328.
Walker, R., Die Heilsgeschichte im ersten Evangelium (FRLANT 91). Göttingen 1967.
Weise, M., "Mt 5:21f. - ein Zeugnis sakraler Rechtssprechung in der Urgemeinde", ZNW 49 (1958) 116-123.
- Kultzeiten und kultischer Bundesschluss in der "Ordensregel" vom Toten Meer (Studia Post-Biblica 3). Leiden 1961.
Wermlund, S., Människan som samhällsvarelse. Inledning till socialpsykologin. 4th ed. Lund 1966.
Wetter, G.P., Der Vergeltungsgedanke bei Paulus. Eine Studie zur Religion des Apostels. Göttingen 1912.

Wiesner, J., Der Bann in seiner geschichtlichen Entwickelung auf dem Boden des Judenthumes (Schriften herausgegeben vom Institute zur Förderung der israelitischen Literatur 9, 1863-1864). Leipzig 1864.
Windisch, H., Taufe und Sünde im ältesten Christentum bis auf Origenes. Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Dogmentgeschichte. Tübingen 1908.
- Der zweite Korintherbrief (MeyerK VI 9). Göttingen 1924.
- Der Hebräerbrief (HNT 14). 2nd ed. Tübingen 1931.
- ζῆλος etc., TWNT II (1933-1935) 904-908.
- Die katholischen Briefe (HNT 15). Dritte, stark ungearbeitete Auflage von H. Preisker. Tübingen 1951.
Zimmerli, W., "Die Eigenart der prophetischen Rede des Ezechiel. Ein Beitrag zum Problem an Hand von Ez. 14, 1-11", ZAW 66 (1954) 1-26.
- "Ich bin Jahwe" in: Geschichte und Altes Testament. Albrecht Alt zum 70. Geburtstag (BHTh 16). Tübingen 1953, pp. 179-209.
Die Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche. Bericht über die siebte Internationale Konferenz für Religionssoziologie in Königstein/Taunus vom 30. Juni bis 2. Juli 1962. Hrsgeg. v. W. Menges und N. Greinacher (Schriften zur Pastoralsoziologie 4). Mainz 1964.

Index of Modern Authors

Adam 79f
Albin 185,214
Allegro 80
Allo 201,212
Alt 35
Arndt 202
Asting 214f

Bacher 111
Baltzer 24,37f,82,85f
Bardtke 79
Barth 197
Barthélemy 79
Bartsch 213
Bauer 105,113,136,175,197,213
Bauernfeind 79f
Baumgartner 36f
Becker 211
Bialoblocki 36
Bietenhardt 81
Billerbeck 92,99,102,105,108-113,126,130,153,197-200,202f,205-207,209,213,215
Billing 200
Black 81
Böcher 210
Boecker 35,198
Bohren 10,105,113,126f,199,201,205,207,211
Bonnard 15,196f,200f
Bornkamm 196,200,204,210
Bousset 208
Brandenburger 204
Braun, F.M. 14
Braun, H. 80f,127,196f,199,210-212,214f
Brichto 23-25,36f
Brown 210f
Brownlee 83
Brun 198,200,210
Buchanan 86
Büchsel 130,198,200,204,213
Bultmann, 151,196,198f,204,206f,209,211,215
Burchard 79

Cambier 145,204
Campenhausen 201,204
Charles 81,159,206,208
Collins 85,215
Conzelmann 141,143,203-205,210,213
Coppens 215
Cross 79

Dahlström 15
Dalman 109,202
Danby 111
Daniel 210
Daube 62,83,198,213
Dauvillier 213
Davies 110,206,209,214
Deissmann 142,202-204
Delcor 201-213
Delitzsch 110
Delling 202,215
Denis 84
Dibelius 134,138,202f,211,213
Dinkler 210
Dobschütz 202
Dodd 198,203,213
Dölger 205
Donahue 109,199
Doskocil 10,105,113,180,199f,205,212,214

Driver 79
Dupont-Sommer 82

Ebeling 15
Eissfeldt 36
Elliger 29,37

Feuillet 207
Finkelstein 102,109,112f
Fitzmyer 86
Foerster 204,209

Gärtner 86,214f
Gerhardsson 201f,204,207f,210
Gesenius 25,36f,83
Giblin 202f
Gingrich 202
Gnilka 196,215
Goguel 159,204,208
Goldstein 110f
Guilbert 79,84

Haenchen 206,210f
Hahn 210
Hare 103,113,196
Harnack 175
Hartman 209
Hauck 208
Heinrici 141
Heise 211
Heitmüller 203
Hempel 36
Hengel 160,208
Hennecke 204
Herford 109
Herkenrath 207
Hoenig 112
Horst 36
Hübner 80
Hunzinger 10f,36,55,79,82f,92-97,99f,102-106,110-114,199,210
Huppenbauer 56,82
Huss 207f
Hvidberg 66,81,85

Isaksson 80
Israel 15

Janzon 207
Jastrow 109f,202
Jaubert 85,215
Jenni 37
Jeremias 108f,147,196f,199-201,205,209,212,215

Kaddari 86
Käsemann 175,202,205
Kapelrud 82,85
Katz 212
Kilian 36,38
Kittel 198
Klostermann 196,198
Koehler 36f,83
Kohler 208
Kohlmeyer 15,199,204,213
Korosec̆ 24
Krauss 102
Kümmel 201,204-207
Kuhn 79,110,208
Kuss 204

Lampe 15,137,202-204,209,215
Latte 204
Liddell 203
Lieberman 15,82f,108,113,209
Lietzmann 141,203-205,210
Lightfoot 141
Linton 198
Lönnermark 210
Lövestam 167,209,211
Lohmeyer 207f,215
Lohse, B. 205
Lohse, E. 112,205

Mc Carthy 24,37
M'Neile 198
Mantel 111f
Mendenhall 24,37
Meyer, A. 210
Meyer, R. 109,113
Michel 79f,193,196,198-200,206,212,215
Mignard 11,15,36f,92,110,199f,209,211
Milik 40,62,79,81-86
Milligan 134,202f
Moe 208
Moore 102,112,205
Moule 203
Moulton 202f
Murphy-O'Connor 15,84,201,204,213
Mussner 214

Nauck 207
Neusner 109,113
Newcomb 15
Nötscher 75,86,214

Odeberg 141,203f,207

Pedersen 24,36f
Pesch 196f
Plummer 141,204
Popkes 204
Poschmann 180,204,206,208,212
Preisker 152,206

Rabin 55,75,79-86,109,203
Rabinowitz 85
Rad 36f
Reicke 81f,202,214
Reventlow 36,38
Riesenfeld 211
Rigaux 135,201-203
Ringgren 36
Robertson 141,204
Rost 79,84f
Roth 79

Sand 204
Satake 207
Scharbert 23,25,36f
Schechter 40,91
Schlatter 141,201,203
Schlier 207
Schmidt 125,198
Schmithals 203
Schmitt 15,210
Schmitz 15
Schnackenburg 152,206f,211
Schneemelcher 204
Schneider 73,86
Schottroff 36f
Schrage 198
Schürer 102,108,112
Schulz 35
Schweizer 204,211
Scott 203
Selwyn 215
Sherwin-White 196
Sjöberg 205
Smith 208
Snaith 36
Sohm 15
Stauffer 207f
Stein 213
Stendahl 133,182,197,201,211,213
Strack 111
Strathmann 202
Strecker 197,199
Streeter 175
Strugnell 79f
Sundkler 209

Thompson 116f,120,126,196-201
Thraede 205
Thyen 200f,209f,214
Trilling 120,196-200
Tsevat 19,36

Unnik 207

Vaux 35f
Vermes 110
Vischer 213
Vliet 199
Vögtle 206,210

Walker 196,209
Weise 80,168,209
Wermlund 15
Wernberg-Møller 79-83
Wetter 204f
Wiesner 103,112f
Windisch 147,152,180,201,205-207, 212,214

Zimmerli 19,36f

Index of References

Old Testament

Genesis
1:4ff 20
27 80
3:14 24
4:11 24
8:21 25
9:5f 16,28
17:14 18,28,36
37:34 112
38:24 16,27
49:7 24

Exodus
12:12 29
15-20 205
15 18,28,36
19 18,28,36
34 147
19:8 188
12f 16
12 17,28,35
21 62
21:12-17 16,28
12 17,35
14 17
15ff 35
15-17 17
17 25
29 16f,28
22 62
22:17f 16
17 17,27
18 27,35
19 21
21-23 17
22:27 25
28 80
24:3 34,188
7 34
26:33 20
30:12ff 54
14 50,63
32 30
33 18f,28,36
38 18f,28,30, 36
31:12-15 16
13 17,29
14f 17,28,35
14 18f,28,36
34:9 85f
35:2 16f,28

Leviticus
4:27 152,206
5:1 23
7:20f 18,28,36
25 18,28,36
27 18,19,28, 36
10:6 112
10 20
11:47 20
13:45 44
17:4 18f,28,36
9f 18,28,36
14 18,19,28, 36
18 19
18:8 203
29 18,27,36
30 29
19 195
19:2 214f
8 18,28,30,36
14 25,96
17f 50,199f
17 47,69,124-126,128f,178, 186,198f
18 45,48
20 16,62
20:2-4 17
2 27,35
3 18,27,29,31, 36
5 18,27,36
7f 29,75
9-13 35
9 17,25,28
10-21 17,27
12 203
13 43
15f 35
17f 18,27,36
23 84
24 20
26 37
27 17,27,35
21 16
21:9 16,27
17-23 76
22:3 18f,28f,36
23:29 18f,28,36
24:10-17 16
11ff 25
15f 80
16f 35
16 17,27
17 17,28

24:21 17,28
23 25
26 32,38
26:30 18
46 32
27:21 21f
28 21f,85
29 16,35

Numerus

1:19ff 54
51 16f,28
3:10 16f,28
38 16f,28
4:4ff 18,23
18ff 28
18 18,36
8:14 20
9:13 18f,28,36
15:11ff 23
27-31 18,42
27 152,206
30f 18,27,30,36
30 15,206
32-36 16
35 17,28,35
16:9 20
18:7 16f,28
14 21f
22 207
19 31
19:13 18,28,30,36
20 18,28,30,36
25 161
25:1-5 16,27
1f 158
11 161
18 207
31:16 161
35:16-34 16
16-18 17,28,35
35:21 17,28,35
30f 17,28
31 35
33 38

Deuteronomium

6:5 210
7:25 21f
26 21
9:18ff 86
26 32
11:26 26
28f 26
13:1-12 16
6 26f,31
7-12 17
10 27
12 31
14ff 21
18 21
16:3 147
17:2-7 16
4 31
6f 27
6 49,69,133,153
7 26f
12 16f,26f,31
13 31
18:15 125
20 16,27
19:11f 16,17
12 28
13 26,28,31
15 49,69,124,128f,133f,153,178,183,186,200
19 26-28
20 31
21:1-9 32
8 32
9 26,28,31
21:18-21 16
21 26,28,31
22 26
22:13-27 16,27
19 80
21f 27
21 31
22 26
24 26f,31
26 207
23:2-4 20
5 25
24:7 16,26,28
16 16
26:18 188
19 32
27-28 25,30
27 26
27:9 30
13 26
14 25
15-26 25
15 27
16ff 28
20ff 27
24f 28
26 26f
28 32,38,143f,193
28:1-14 85
1 30
15 26
16-68 85
18 143
31f 143
35 143
45 26,30
58 30
29 41f
29:1-7 85
9-20 41
11 24,37,80
13 24,37
16 41,193
29:17 80,176,193
18-27 24,37,80,85
19 37
20 20,24,37
26 26
28 80
30:1 26
15 188
19 26,34,188
32 193

Joshua

1:18 16f,27
6:18 21
21 22
24 22
26 24
7 21f,172
7:1 210
12 21
15 16
8:34 26
9:22 24
24:2-13 85
9 25
16 188
22 188
24 188

Judges

6:28 18
9:26f 25
17:2 23,37
20:13 16
21:5 16,35

1 Samuel

2:3 77
33 18,28,36
14:24ff 37
24 23,36
17:43 25
28:9 18,27,36

2 Samuel

12:15-23 112
15:30 112
16:5ff 25

1 Kings

8:31f 23
31 37
9:7 18,27,36
14:10 18,27,36
14 18,27,36
16:34 24
18:4 161
40 161
19:2 161
14 161
21 161
21 18,27,36

2 Kings

2:24 25,142
9:7 161
8 18,27,36
10:16f 161
14:6 16

1 Chronicles

9:20 208
16:30 77
23:13 20

2 Chronicles

6:22 23,37
15:13 16,27
14 86
25:4 16
34:24 37

Ezra

10:2 85
5 86
8 20-22,33

Nehemiah

9:7-31 85
16ff 86
33-35 85
10:29f 86
13:2 25
3 20,33

Job

1-2 144
1:10 143
14-17 143
18f 143
20 112
2:6 143
7 143
28:25 77

Psalms

7:10 162
19:9 85
37:9 18,36
22 26,36
75:3 77
77 211
93:1 77
96:10 77
106:29f 208

Proverbs

2:22 18,36
3:11 198
9:7f 48
16:2 77
17:26 83
21:2 77
11 83
22:3 83
24:12 77
27:12 83

Isaiah

3:26 112
9:13 18,36
11:4 161
43:28 21
47:1 112
48:9 18,36
56:3ff 20
65:12 198
66:5 106

Jeremiah

3:14 89
11:20 162
17:10 162
25:9 21
31 70
31:34 73
44:7f 18,36
11 18,36

Lamentations

2:10 112

Ezekiel

14:7f 18
8 27,36
13 80
16:49 45
59 37
17:13 37
16 37
19 37
18:13 16,35
20:18 203
24:17 112
44:29 21f

Daniel

9:4ff 37

Hosea

4:2 37
10:4 37

Amos

8:9 81

Micah

1:8 112
2:12 141
5:12 18

Zephaniah

1:4 18,27,36

Zechariah

3:2ff 185
5:3 37
13:2 18
8 18,36
14:11 21

Malachi

2:5 135
11f 18
12 18,27,36
3:24 21

OT Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

4 Ezra

13:4 162

Tobit

3:4 198

Wisdom of Solomon

5:6 214

Ecclesiasticus

3:23 202
19:13f 81
22:13 179
45:23-26 208

1 Maccabees

2:26 208

Psalms of Solomon

17:23-51 162

1 Enoch

1:9 198
62:2 162

Test. Issachar

7:1 153

Test. Gad

6:3ff 81

Jubilees

2:31 44
21:22 153,206
26:34 153,206

Qumran Texts

1QS 39f
1QS I 1 80
3 86
5 86
7 72
8 71,83
9f 45,86,215
I 11-III 12 61,72
I 11-II 25 52,53
I 12f 83f
12 77
I 18-II 18 72
I 18-22 85
20 86
22ff 74
I 23-II 1 85
II 1-4 85
2 83
4-18 85
4-10 168,209
4-7 40
10 86
11-17 41f,80,193
12-14 40
18 86
20-23 72
24 86
II 25-III 12 52,53,188
II 25 60,86
III 1 85
2 61,82-84
3 83
4ff 72,78
4f 40
5 44,100
6f 50
8ff 74
8 78
9 83
11 71
13 82
III 15-IV 1 85

1QS IV 2-6 45
2 86
5 42,82
22 71,83
V 2f 52
2 72,83f
3 50-52
5 45,71,84
6 86
7ff 50
7-24 52,53f,61
7 82
8 72f
9 72
10 43
11-20 54
11f 42
12ff 74
13ff 43
13 55,78,82,86
14 84
16 84
18 86
20 84,86
21f 50
V 24-VI 1 127f,199f
V 24-26 47
26f 50
VI 1 48,52
2f 197
2 86
3-8 56
3 82
4f 197
4 77
7 80
8-13 52,57
8 77
9 50,77
10 77,82
11f 82
12 50f

1QS VI 13ff 165
VI 13-VII 25 62
VI 13-23 52,54-57,64
83
14f 60,70
14 50,60,82
16ff 68
16f 55,61
16 82
17 61,82,138
19 84
20 50,55,83
22f 57,61
22 77,82,84,
138
24ff 173
VI 24-VII 25 46,52,57-59
VI 24 50
25 82-84
26 86
27 83
VII 1f 43,46
2-6 83
2 59,82
3 82
6f 83
6 84
VIII 8-16 83
10 81
12-14 43
16f 46
16 82
17 49,59
18f 83
19 57f,82
20 58,83
21 77
22ff 46
22 82
24 59,82,138
25 44,46,76,
82,84
VIII 1ff 51
1-10 51,82
1 209

1QS VIII 3 82
4 77
5f 86
5 82
6f 82,168,209
8 86
10 82f
11f 86
11 81-83
13 77
15 62,72
16ff 42
VIII 16-IX 11 62
VIII 16-IX 2 52,59-61,62,
84
VIII 16-IX 1 84
1QS VIII 16-19 59f,61
17 82f,86,152,
206
18 83
19 77
20ff 83
VIII 20-IX 2 59,61
VIII 20 60,66,86
21 83,86
22ff 42
22 72,82f,152,
206
23 61,82,84,86,
138
24 82,152,206
IX 1 42,57f,83
2 77,83,86
5 83
6 83,86
7 51f,84
8 61,82-84,86,
138
12ff 62
12 77,82,215
15f 45
16f 48,138,215
18 77
19 83
21f 45

1QS IX 21 82
22 84
IX 26-XI 22 62
X 3 83
9 77
17 81
19-21 207
20f 74
XI 8 82,86

1QSa 40,62,72,79
1QSa I 4 43
9 86
13 86
15 51
24 51
II 5-9 76
9 86
20 56

1QSb 62
1QSb I 2 70
III 26 85
V 20 85

1QH I 15 77
IV 11 83
VIII 4 83
XIV 17 86

1QM 80
1QM VIII 3-6 76
3 43

1QpHab. II 3 85
1QpHab. IV 13 45
1Q 34 85
4QS[c] 83
4QS[d] 81,83
4QS[e] 62,83
4QS[g] 50
4Q 159 43,51,80,
82f
4QpPs. 37 80
4QD[b] 40,76,84,
121

4QD[e] 40,81
5Q 11 40
5Q 12 40,81
5Q 13 40
6QD[e] 43

CD I 1-VI 11 70,85
II 7 71
III 4 83
12ff 75
12-14 71
14 44
IV 9f 71
17 43
20f 43,80
V 7-11 43,80
VI 7 71
VI 11-VII 4 71
VI 15ff 43
15 64,84,86
17f 86
19 85
VI 20-VII 1 45
VII 1f 43
3f 43,50
4-6 71
4f 43,66
5 86
6-9 63
6 42
8 71
VII 9-VIII 1 71
VIII 4f 86
5-7 43
16 71
21 85
IX 1 64
2-4 127f
2 48
6ff 50
6-22 153
6f 81
6 65
7-10 40
10 51

CD IX 16ff 49
16-23 133f,201f
17 65
18-22 51
18 138
21 49f,64f,82
22 50
23 64f,82
X 1-10 51
1 50,52,65
2f 42,50
4 82
X 14-XI 18 44
XI 4 138
23 85
XII 1f 43
1 40
3 65
4-6 44,64
6ff 45
6-11 43
6 81
8-11 84
12-20 86
19f 86
21 82
XIII 7ff 51
7-17 50
10 82
11f 165
11 64,84
13 51
14-16 64,84
15f 51
22 82
XIV 2 83
4 81
5f 52,64
6 81
11 51
12ff 64,84
13ff 51,63
13-16 45
13 51
15 81

CD XIV 20ff 81
20f 65
21 83
XV 1-5 81
4 51
5-11 63f,72
5 65
6-8 73
7-11 64
7f 51
8 54,113
9 71
10f 86
14 85
16 51
XVI 1-6 72
6 45
10-12 63
17 83
XIX 3-5 63
11ff 65
XIX 13-XX 13 65-67
XIX 13 85
XIX 26-XX 15 85
XX 2ff 48,215
2 83,86
4 78,138
5 83,86
7 83f,86
8-13 42
15ff 47
25f 65
25 86
27-34 74
30f 42
32f 71

Philo

Def. 11:18 80
13 45
Quod omnis 81 85
87 45

Josephus

Bellum I 78-80 79
II 111-113 79
II 119-161 40,79
II 120f 80
II 120 45
II 122 203
II 124 45
II 137ff 55,68
II 139-142 73
II 143f 69,78
II 145 42,52,69
II 146f 46
II 147ff 44
II 150 68
II 160f 80
VII 417 208
Ant. XIII 288 108
XIV 22 111

Rabbinic Texts

Mishnah
Dem II 2f 88
Orl II 12 205
RSh I 6 111
Taan II 7 100
III 8 93
MKat III 1f 112
Hag III 6 109
Sanh V 1 199
VIII 4 199
XII 8f 199
Makk I 8f 199
Eduy V 6 93f,112
V 7 103,111
Ab III 2 201
Midd II 2 95,100-102, 112f
Kel V 10 111
Toh VII 6 109

Tosephta
Dem II 2 88

Dem II 9 89
11f 88
12 109
III 4 90,127
Betz II 15 111
Sanh XI 1-5 199

Bab. Talmud
Ber 19a 94f,111,113
27b 113
28b 91
63a 111
Pes 49b 108
53a 111
Betz 23a 111
Taan 23ab 111
23a 107
MKat 15aff 100
15ab 112
16a 101
17a 111
Sot 47a 110
48a 153
Kidd 28a 97
BK 94b 199
BM 59ab 111
59a 205
59b 101,106,107
Sanh 25b 109
40b-41a 199
68a 111f
106b 208
107b 110
Makk 6b 81
Men 37a 111
Bekh 30b 165
31a 90

Palest. Talmud
Ber IV 7c 110
Dem II 22c 81
II 22d 165
II 23a 90,109,113
Shab I 3d 113
II 5b 111

Pes	VII	34a	111
Taan	III	66d	111
MKat	III	81cd	111
	III	81c	107
	III	81d	95,107,111, 113
Kidd	IV	65b	113
Sanh	V	22c	199

Midrashim etc.

Lev. R	16:116c	112
Sifre Num.	15:31	205
	15:33	199
Pseudo-Jon. Num.	30	201
Derek Erez	1, 18c	111

New Testament

Matthew

3:1	117
6	184
10	169
4:1	143
15	129
5:11	106
21f	168
28f	197
5:29f	119,123f
46f	125,129
48	214f
6:7	129
12	132,164
14f	132
7:1-6	209
1	164,190,192,194,215
2	215
3-5	190
6	164,166f,188
7	201
15-20	169f,174,180
15	124,158,164
19	124,177,179
7:20	124
28	196
8:10ff	189
12	211
29	215
9:10f	129
10:5	164,166
11	164,166,168
13	166,211
14	166
32f	164
37f	164f,166f
37	189
11:1	196
19	164
20ff	212
11:25	117,121,189
28	164
12:1	117
11	75
21	129
31f	167,173
13:24ff	164
24-30	190,193
41	124,197
53	196
14:1	117
15:21-28	166
16:18	125,198
19	130,201
23	170,197
24	165
26	125
17:5	125
17:22-18:35	116f
17:22f	196
24-27	120
25f	196
18	15,115,116-119,120-132, 137,151,163,184f,192, 196,200f
18:1-4	119-121,187f
1	132,196
3	189,196
18:4	196
6-14	123
6	197
7	122,197
8-9	121-124,164,168-171, 177,179
10ff	122
10-14	130
10	121,196
12-18	15
12	185
14	196
15-20	124-142
15-17	10,124-132,164,170, 177f,183,186,188,198-200
15f	197
15	198f,213
16	133,182,201
17	198
18-20	126
18	130f,196
19f	131,182,197,201
19	196
20	142,201
21-35	131f
21f	125
21	124,201
23	196
31	196
34	196
35	196
19	118
19:1	196
12	196
14	196
21	196
23	196
25	120
27	120
21:12	211
31f	129
32	200
39	211
22:8	166
13	211
23:5-12	121
11	120
13	130
24:10f	124
11	169
24	169
43	160
45	120
25:16f	125
20	125
22	125
30	211
26:1	196
27:4	124
52	214
28:19	129,203

Mark

1:5	184
16ff	164
29ff	189
2:14f	164,189
16	164
3:28f	164,167,173
5:34ff	189
36	125,198
6:11	164,166,188f
7:15	189
24-30	166
27	164,188
8:33	169f
34	164f
36	125
38	164,167
9:33-37	119f
35	121
42	118,122
43-47	122f
49f	122
10:2-9	80
14ff	189
14	164
15	120
21	189
11:24	201

11:25 182
13:22 169

Luke

4:29 211
6:22 106
26 169
43-45 169,174
46 169
7:47 189
8:50 198
9:5 166
23 166
25 125
26 167
61f 189
10:7 202
11 166
38ff 164
42 189
12:8f 167,173
10 167,177,211
11f 173
13f 213
39 160
57-59 190
14:33 164f
15:2 164
4-7 119
17:1 197
3f 164
3 118,125,129
4 125,199
18:1 203
17 120
19:1ff 164
7 164
23:43 189
24:49 142

John

3:20 198,213
6:37 174,211
7:53-8:11 211

8:9 198,213
46 213
9:22 105
34f 211
12:42 105
15:1-8 174f,177,180
2f 182
7 182
16:2 105
8 198,213
20:23 130
31 152,163

Acts

2:38 142,203
44f 199
3:13f 167
18ff 212
4 199
4:32-35 172
34 210
36f 173
5 10,187,199
5:1-11 15,144,172f,174,178,182,186,211
2 210
3 211
4 210f
9 211
32 199
6:2 212
6 184
8 187
8:16 203
17f 184
18-24 172,173f,178,182,211
21f 211
24 194
10:48 203
13:3 184
51 166
15 158,208
15:12 212
30 212

19:5 203
6 184
18 185
20:20 135
27 135

Rome

2:1 192
28f 145
5-8 203
5:19 198
6:6 146
11 146
7:6 149
8:4ff 145
11:33 158
14 192f
14:14 191
15:13 142
16 191
16:17 171f,177,179
18 213
20 204

1 Corinthians

1-4 139f,203
1:2 191
13 203
15 203
1:18-3:23 203
1:29 140
2:10 158
3:16 139,205
21 140
4:5 192
6 203
7 140
18f 203
5-6 139f,203
5 10,12,15,115,139f,141-151,158,160,178,180f,186,192,203
5:1-5 170,172,179
1f 141

5:1 140,150
2 139,212
3-5 141-147
4 134,212
5 183,187,212f
6-8 147-149,191,195,212
6 140,193,205
9-13 149-151,171f,179,192
9 138
10 191
11 138,191,213
6:1-11 180f,186,203
2f 205
4 213
5 203
9f 140
9 205
12-20 203
15f 205
17 149
18 205
19 139
7:1 150
14 191
8-10 196
8 139
8:1 203
9 136
9:4 135
6 135
12 135
13 205
14 202
18 135f
24 205
10 158
10:20 205
21 191
27 191
11:28 210
30-32 145
13 139
13:4 203
16:22f 171

2 Corinthians

2 15,186
2:1-11 179f,212
6f 213
4:1 203
16 203
6:14-7:1 191f,215
7:1 145
8-12 179f
11 191
12 212
8:20 135
10:6 198
11 213
11 136
11:4 158
11:7 135
27 135
12:7ff 143
12:20-13:2 171f,178
12:21 140
13 150
13:1f 133f,179,201f
1 175,183,186
11 213

Galatians

1:8f 171,177
9 134
2:12 135
3:3 145
4:23 145
29 145
5:9 205
16ff 146
17 145
19ff 145
19 140
21 140
22ff 145
24 146
6:1 180,185,213
8 145
9 137,203

Ephesians

1:19 142
3:13 203
3:18 158
20 142
4:26 81
5:3 140
5 140
8-11 180
11 186,198,213
12 180
6:11 204

Philippians

3:3 145
12 179

Colossians

2:5 145
12-15 146
13 141
18 203
3:5 140

1 Thessalonians

2 136
2:1 205
9 133,135
4:1 201
3 140
10f 133
11f 134
11 202
5:2ff 160
14 132,134
20f 158

2 Thessalonians

2:2 133,207
8 162
3 150
3:6-15 115,132-139,170,172,177,179,201

3:6 132,134f,136f,142
7-10 135f,137
7f 133
7 134
8 202
10 134f
11f 136f
11 134,201
12 133,202
13-15 137-139
13 203
14f 10
14 136,186,192
15 135,186

1 Timothy

1:18-20 176f
20 145,183,187
4:1-3 176
14 184
5:19f 183,186
19 133
20 198,214
21f 184

2 Timothy

1:6 184
2:17f 176
21 194,205
25f 194
3:1-9 176
5 177
4:2 198
14 176
15 176

Titus

1:9 198
13 198
2:15 183,198
3:10f 176f,183,186
11 213

Hebrews

3:13 81
4:12 162
6:2 184
4-8 176f,193
4-6 212
7:27 212
8:6-10:18 212
9:12 212
10:10 212
25 176
26-31 176f,193,215
26 153
29 212
38 135
12:5 198
14 177
15-24 193
15 176f

James

1:18 214
2:9 198
3:14 214
17 214
4:11f 194
5:9 194
13-20 184f
15-20 182,194
19f 214

1 Peter

2:5 195
4:6 145f
5:8 204

2 Peter

2:1 158
3:10 160

1 John

1:5ff 151

1:6-2:6 152
1:7ff 155
8 152
9 155,185
10 152
2:28 154
3:4-12 152
4 152
6 152,155
8 152
9 206
21f 206
21 154
4:1 158
17 154
5:13-21 153-155
13 151
14-21 151f
14-18 152
14 206
16f 115,151-155,174f,177,185,215
16 182f,194
18f 152
18 206

2 John
7-10 158
7 175
9 175
10f 175,177,182,193

3 John 175f,183,187
9 183
10 177,182,193,211

Jude
9 185
15 198
22f 185f,194,214
22 184

Revelation
1 156
1:11 156
16 161
19 156
2-3 115,156-163,174,194,207
2:2 175,177,182,207
5 208
9 207
13 207
14-16 176f
16 208
19 207
20 176f
22f 208
24f 208
3:1 207
3ff 212
3 208
4 194
8 207
11 208
15 207
19 198,213
4-21 156
8:1 156
19:11-16 159
15ff 159
15 161

Apostolic Fathers

Did. 4:14 185
9:3 167
9:4 171
11-12 158,169
11:9 169
11:12 169
12 203
14:1 185

1 Clem. 43:1 137
Ign. Eph. 7:1 209
9:1 158
Ign. Magn. 6:1 209
Ign. Trall. 3:1 209
Ign. Philad. 8:1 209
Ign. Smyrn. 4:1 158
Mart. Polycarp. 207
Herm. Mand. XI 169

Other References

Corp. Inscr. Att. App. 108 142,203
Greek Papyri in British Museum I,75 143,204
POxy II 275:24ff 202
POxy IV 725:39ff 202
OGIS 168 203
OGIS 629 203
Caius Instit. I 63 203
Acta Petri Vercellenses 2 204
Acta Thomae 6 204
Justinus Dial. Trypho XVI 4, CVIII 2 110
Hippolyte Ref. 23:3 86
Ref. 26:2 44
Pliny Naturalis hist. V 17 80

10522
5-42
C

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF. A14053